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## Editorial

No. 56

## by Alan Borwell December 1996

We hope that this edition will reach you before the festive period and Moira and I send best wishes for a Happy Christmas and New Year 1997 to all our readers. There are lots of games this time to enjoy during the holiday!

Our competitions for 1996 are mostly completed and special congratulations go to Simon Gillam and Joe Watson (again!), who were joint winners of the Scottish CC Championship 1995/6, and to Black Knight as the new League Champions, after narrowly edging out Kirkcaldy Kings! Entries for the new season's tournaments were due by the end of November, but Alan Hind may have a few vacancies at the last minute, if you contact him immediately!

On the international scene, we are delighted that David Kilgour has been allocated a place in the new World CC Individual Final, resulting from his virtually certain top 4 placing in the World $3 / 4$-Final. As Scotland's first ever representative in a World CC Individual Final, we wish David every success (a detailed list of participants appears on page 23). The XI Olympiad Final remains a cliffhanger, with Scotland holding a wafer-thin advantage over Canada for the bronze medal and Russia still possible contenders.

A few weeks ago, we thought that we may be short of material for this edition but there was a great response to our our S.O.S. and we were over-subscribed. However, all articles/games received will be published in subsequent editions - our grateful thanks to all concerned!
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## Secretarial Notes - The New CC Season

[Alan Hind]
It seems like a long, long time ago when our Editor gave me the above topic for the Secretarial Notes of our New Year issue. Unfortunately, at the time of writing, I am unable to set out anything meaningful about the new season as I still have not been able to get the old one concluded (and this is being written at the end of the first week in December!)
It is with regret that I have to inform you of the death of one of our long-time members, Tom McMorran of Currie near Edinburgh. Tom had been a Life Member for many, many years and, in that time, played in (and won) a number of Quartet Sections and Trophy Finals. Tom will be sorely missed by us all.
As regards the new season, entries have been slow to come in, but at least it looks hopeful that we will have enough direct qualifiers for a Championship this year. There are a number of new members but, disappointingly, a significant number of non-renewals. Bernard Milligan has just started to phone around and indications are that more than a few received their entry form with the last magazine and promptly forgot about it. Next year, we ought to send them out separately closer to the end-of-season date.

During 1997, we will again be starting Major and Minor sections as soon as the appropriate number of entries are received. These will be of twelve months duration, with winners and runners-up qualifying for the next promoted tournament to start. Entries to the Quartet, Openings, Endgame or Challenge tournaments can also be made mid-season.
Editor's Footnote Although I had not met Tom McMorran for some 30 years, I do remember him! Whilst in Edinburgh in 1965/6 I was paired against him in the Semi-final of the League Individual K.O. Tournament (OTB). I had arranged to play him just before Christmas but had forgotten that it was the evening of the office party! Arriving for the game, I found that the squares and pieces were already moving before I touched them, but somehow I managed to scramble a draw! Having learned my lesson, I approached the replay with the white pieces with great determination and a clear mind and lost in 20 moves. That's chess - thanks for the memory, Tom!


The Executive Committee of the Scottich CPAt mish all readers a Vory Merry Christmas and much Happiness in the Coming Year


| No |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | J COPLEY | - | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 3 |
| 2 | S R GILLAM | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| 3 | A T HISLOP | 1/2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 3 |
| 4 | D A HUGHSON | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 11/2 |
| 5 | G W G LIVIE | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | - | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 6 | MP ROBERTS | 1 | 0 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | - | 1/2 | 0 | 21/2 |
| 7 | T THOMSON | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 2 |
| 8 | J WATSON | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | - | 6 |

## CANDIDATES 1995/96

## SECTION A

| No |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Pts | $1 \mathrm{st}=$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | S BRADY | * | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 |  |
| 2 | MHDUNN | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $1 \mathrm{st}=$ |
| 3 | I MACKINTOSH | 0 | 1 | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |  |
| 4 | A MacQuEEN | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 |  |
| 5 | S A MURRAY | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | - | 1 | 1/2 | $41 / 2$ | 3rd |
| 6 | JRYAN | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | * | 1 | 2 |  |
| 7 | K SEYFRIED | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | - | 11/2 |  |

## SECTION B

| No |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Pts | 3rd |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | W M COOK | - | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 41/2 |  |
| 2 | D R CUMMING | 0 | - | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 0 | 2 |  |
| 3 | C J LENNOX | 1/2 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 5 | 1st= |
| 4 | S MACGILCHRIST | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | $\bullet$ | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | 21/2 |  |
| 5 | A N MacMILLEN | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | - | 1/2 | 0 | 1 |  |
| 6 | A C NORRIS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | - | 0 | 1 |  |
| 7 | R TURNER | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 5 | 1st= |

## CANDIDATES 1996/97

## SECTION A

| No |  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | Pts |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B GOODWIN | $\bullet$ |  | $\mathbf{1}$ | - |  | $\mathbf{0}$ |  |  |
| 2 | A WRIGHT |  | $\bullet$ |  | - | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ |  |  |
| 3 | M HARKINS | $\mathbf{0}$ |  | - | - | $\mathbf{1}$ | $1 / 2$ |  |  |
| 4 | J A CLAYTON | $\mathbf{0}$ | 0 | $\mathbf{0}$ | - | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | w/d |
| 5 | I A MACKINTOSH |  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | - | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |
| 6 | A T HISLOP | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $1 / 2$ | - |  | $\bullet$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |  |
| 7 | A N MacMILLEN |  |  |  | - |  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\bullet$ |  |

SECTION B

| No |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | D CRICHTON | - | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2 | A NISBET | 1 | - |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1/2 |  |
| 3 | J COPLEY |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| 4 | A R ANGUS |  | 0 |  | $\checkmark$ |  | 1 | 0 |  |
| 5 | R TURNER |  | 1 |  |  | - | 1 |  |  |
| 6 | JRYAN | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1/2 |  |
| 7 | J A FINDLAY | 1 | 1/2 |  | 1 |  | 1/2 | - |  |

## SECTION C

| No |  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | Pts |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | D A HUGHSON | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | W M COOK |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | K SEYFRIED |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | $1 / 2$ |  |  |
| 4 | D R R ELLIS |  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\bullet$ |  | 1 | $\mathbf{1}$ |  |
| 5 | I REEMAN |  |  | $\mathbf{1}$ |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |
| 6 | G H BIRD |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 0 | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |
| 7 | S COLLINS |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |

[^0]PREMIER TOURNAMENTS 1996
Controller:J. Anderson

## SECTION A

| No |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | W HYND | - | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 2 | F HALL | 0 | - | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1 |
| 3 | G LLOYD | 1/2 | 1/2 | $\bullet$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 4 | K GORDON | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 5 | J A FINDLAY | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 51/2 |
| 6 | A G E BIRD | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | - | 1/2 | 1/2 | 4 |
| 7 | S M YOUNG | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | - | 0 | 41/2 |
| 8 | S RILEY | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | $\checkmark$ | 6 |

SECTION B

| No |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | D TRENNER | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 11/2 |
| 2 | G SAXTON | 1 | - | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 3 | R BEACON | 1 | 0 | $\bullet$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 4 | S G MACKENZIE | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 6 |
| 5 | W HARPER | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 21/2 |
| 6 | D R CUMMING | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | - | 1/2 | 1/2 | 31/2 |
| 7 | ISNEDDON | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | - | 1/2 | 41/2 |
| 8 | R WESTON | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | - | 4 |

SECTION C

| No |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | K J GUTHRIE | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | M MAY | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 21/2 |
| 3 | J M HERRIES | 1 | 1 | - | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21/2 |
| 4 | F TEUNISSE | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | - | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 41/2 |
| 5 | ACBROWN | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 6 | R A GIULIAN | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | - | 1 | 41/2 |
| 7 | MHARKINS | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 0 | - | 4 |

## SECTION D

| No |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | B MILLIGAN | - | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 11/2 |
| 2 | A ROBERTS | 1/2 | - | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $21 / 2$ |
| 3 | A D KILGARIFF | 1/2 | 1/2 | - | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 2 |
| 4 | F TEUNISSE | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | - | 1/2 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 3 |
| 5 | A MacQUEEN | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | - | 1 | 1/2 | 5 |
| 6 | A R ANGUS | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 3 |
| 7 | S RIIEY | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | - | 4 |

MAJOR TOURNAMENTS 1996 Contoller: A Maxwell


MINOR TOURNAMENTS 1996 Controller: D. Savage

| No | SECTION A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | CMDOWELL | - | $1 / 20$ | 1/21 | 11/2 | 11/2 | 5 |
| 2 | M JESSING | 1/21 | - | 11 | 11 | 11 | $71 / 2$ |
| 3 | A R PETRIE | 01/2 | 00 | - | $1 / 20$ | 01/2 | 11/2 |
| 4 | J S CRAWLEY | 01/2 | 00 | 1/21 | - | 11 | 4 |
| 5 | M G BROWN | 01/2 | 00 | 11/2 | 00 | - | 2 |



| No | Postal Knight | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | T McMORRAN | - | 00 | 00 | 00 | 0 |
| 2 | A MacQueEN | 11 | - | 1/2 | \%o | 4 |
| 3 | A WRIGHT | 11 | 0 '2 | - | \% ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 3/2 |
| 4 | E A BAILEY | 11 | /21 | $\mathrm{K}_{2} / 2$ | - | $4 / 2$ |


| No | Postal Shield | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | 4 | Pts |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | R BEACON | $\bullet$ | 00 | 00 | 01 | 1 |
| 2 | I MACKINTOSH | 11 | 4 | $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ | 11 | $5 \mathrm{H}_{2}$ |
| 3 | AC BROWN | 11 | 012 | 4 | 00 | $2 \mathrm{H}_{2}$ |
| 4 | A ROBERTS | 10 | 00 | 11 | 4 | 3 |


| No | Q188 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Pts |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | R BEACON |  | 01 | 11 | 11 | 5 |
| 2 | JACLAYTON | 10 | 4 | 11 | 11 | 5 |
| 3 | C DOWELL | 00 | 00 |  | 11 | 2 |
| 4 | S SUTHERLAND | 00 | 00 | 00 | $\uparrow$ | 0 |


| No | Q189 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Pts |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  | | 1 | JANDERSON | $\star$ | 00 | $11 / 2$ | 11 | $31 / 2$ |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | D |  |  |  |  |  |

 | 3 | R LOUGHRAN | $01 / 2 / 2 y_{2}$ | $\bullet 1 / 2$ | 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 | D |  |  |  |

| No | Q190 | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | Pts |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | JCASSIDY | 4 | 11 | 00 | 00 | 2 |
| 2 | C MACGREGOR | 00 | 4 | $y_{2} 0$ | 00 | $1 / 2$ |
| 3 | B W GRANT | 11 | $1 / 21$ | 4 | $1 / 21_{2}$ | $4 / 2$ |
| 4 | S M YOUNG | 11 | 11 | $1 / 2 / 2$ | 4 | 5 |


| No | Q191 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Pts |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AG E BIRD | 4 | 11 | $1 / 2 \gamma_{2}$ | 10 | 4 |
| 2 | J W KILGOUR | 00 | $\ddots$ | 00 | 00 | 0 |
| 3 | G PLANT | $1 / 2 / 2$ | 11 | 4 | 11 | 5 |
| 4 | T A H TAYLOR | 01 | 11 | 00 | 4 | 3 |


| No | Q192 | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | Pts |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | R BEACON | $\bullet$ |  |  | $0 \%$ |  |
| 2 | A CAMPBELL |  | $*$ |  |  |  |
| 3 | J RAWLINSON |  |  | $*$ |  |  |
| 4 | I SNEDDON | $1 / 1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  |

> MAJOR/MINOR/QUARTETS/CHALLENGE Entries can be made at any time to Alan Hind. New pairings will be arranged when there are sufficient new players to do so.

## OPENINGS TOURNAMENTS 1996 controler T Thomson

| No | Section A | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | Pts |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | J G BLENCOWE | $\bullet$ |  | 11 |  |
| 2 | JW KILGOUR |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | S SUTHERLAND | 00 |  |  |  |



Opening moves are: $1 \mathrm{~d} 4 \mathrm{c} 52 \mathrm{~d} 5 \mathrm{f5}$ (Clarendon Court Defence)

## OPENINGS TOURNAMENTS 1996



> If you've enjoyed playing international opponents in friendly matches, then why not try an ICCF event? Details are given in the blue entry form which is enclosed with this magazine.

TOO MUCH INFORMATION = NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION MONOCRAPHS MAKE MEITHER THIS NOR THAT MISTAKE

## CHALLENGE TOURNAMENT

## [by Bernard Milligan]

Another season in the Challenge has drawn to a close. Thanks to all competitors for making my job relatively easy and in particular to those players who took on extra opponents on an "as required" basis. If anyone in next season's competition can help in a similar manner, then please let me know. All volunteers will be greatly appreciated.
I will calculate the points for prizewinners and promotion in about a fortnight. This will allow for any late results notification. From information from other members, I am pretty certain that the postal strikes caused some mail to go missing. This may have meant that results sent in were not received. Please check the outstanding results below to ensure I know about all results for completed games. Prizewinners and promotions will be reported in the next magazine.
Pairings for next season should be with you by early January. I will try to send them out sooner if possible.
I hope everyone has a relaxing and enjoyable Christmas!
Pairings since the last Magazine are as follows:

| Class 1 | Pairings/Opponents' Membership Nos |
| :--- | :--- |
| A.Armstrong (049) | 155,337 |
| D.R. Cumming (166) | LM2, 264,315 |
| I. Sneddon (057) | 337 |
| Class 2 |  |
| R.Beacon (155) | $049,233,359$ |
| R. Crosbie (233) | 155,346 |
| G. Lloyd (264) | LM2, $166,315,337,346,352,356,357$ |
| A.R. Petrie (315) | 166,357 |
| Class 3 |  |
| C. Almazo-Mato (317) | 261 |
| M. Chapman (359) | 155 |
| C. Dowell (316) | 315,346 |
| R. Loughran (337) | $049,057,261,264$ |
| G.R. McDonald (352) | 264 |
| G. Saxton (311) | 308 |
| Class 4 |  |
| C.R. James (312) | $315,346,355$ |
| T. McAinsh (261) | $108,317,337$ |
| D.G. McRoberts (LM2) | $166,264,346$ |
| D.G. Meldrum (355) | 312 |
| A.R. Petrie (315) | $264,312,316$ |
| Class 5 |  |
| A.C.W. Robson (357) | $264,308,315,316,346$ |
| J.F. Rutherford (356) | 264 |
| S.F. Sutherland (308) | $264,311,364$ |
| P. Wildig (346) | LM2, 233, 264, 305, 312, 316, 357 |
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The following results were notified in the period $1 / 9 / 96$ to 23/11/96

| 1049 | A. Armstrong | 0 | 1 | D.R. Curnming | 166 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 049 | A. Armstrong | 1 | 0 | K. Gordon | 051 |
| 049 | A. Armstrong | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | C. Dowell | 316 |
| 049 | A. Armstrong | 1 | 1 | A.C. Brown | 215 |
| 049 | A. Armstrong | 2 | 0 | M. Hodgson | 339 |
| 317 | C. Almarza-Mato | 1 | 1 | R.B.Crosbie | 233 |
| 317 | C. Almarza-Mato | $1 / 2$ | $11 / 2$ | A.R. Petrie | 315 |
| 155 | R. Beacon | 1 | 0 | D.R. Cumming | 166 |
| 155 | R. Beacon | 1 | 0 | A.C. Brown | 215 |
| 155 | R. Beacon | 1 | 1 | I. Sneddon | 057 |
| 155 | R. Beacon | 0 | 2 | J. Henderson | 347 |
| 155 | R. Beacon | 0 | 1 | E. Bolduc | 349 |
| 155 | R. Beacon | 1 | 0 | G. Lloyd | 264 |
| 155 | R. Beacon | 1 | 1 | R. Loughran | 337 |
| 302 | C. Black | 2 | 0 | C.R. James | 312 |
| 349 | E. Bolduc | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | I. Sneddon | 057 |
| 040 | J.S. Caimey | 0 | 2 | I. Sneddon | 057 |
| 108 | J. Cassidy | 2 | 0 | P. Wildig | 346 |
| 108 | J. Cassidy | 0 | 2 | S. Robinson | 319 |
| 108 | I. Cassidy | 2 | 0 | M. Hodgson | 339 |
| 233 | R.B. Crosbie | $1 / 2$ | $11 / 2$ | M.P. Ford | 219 |
| 233 | R.B. Crosbie | 0 | 2 | J.P.E. Jack | LM15 |
| 233 | R.B. Crosbie | $1 / 2$ | $11 / 2$ | T.F. McAinsh | 261 |
| 166 | D.R. Cumming | $1 / 2$ | $11 / 2$ | R. Loughran | 337 |
| 219 | M.P. Ford | 2 | 0 | S. Robinson | 319 |
| 219 | M.P. Ford | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | G. Lloyd | 264 |
| 337 | R. Loughran | 1 | 1 | J.P.E. Jack | LM15 |
| 337 | R. Loughran | 2 | 0 | C.R. James | 312 |
| 337 | R. Loughran | 0 | 2 | M. May | 199 |
| 312 | C.R. James | 0 | 2 | S. Robinson | 319 |
| 312 | C.R. James | 0 | 1 | G. Plant | 229 |
| 312 | C.R. James | 1 | 1 | A.R. Petrie | 315 |
| 312 | C.R. James | 2 | 0 | M. Hodgson | 339 |
| 261 | T.F. McAinsh | 2 | 0 | A.R. Petrie | 315 |
| 308 | S.F. Sutherland | 0 | 2 | A. McIntosh | 314 |
| 315 | A.R. Petrie | 1 | 1 | P. Wildig | 346 |
| 308 | SF. Sutherland | 0 | 1 | A.R. Petrie | 315 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

The games overleaf had adjudication dates of $15 / 11 / 96$. At the time of sending in this article I had not received results and have assumed that they have been carried forward to next season. If any were completed before adjudication date, then please let me know the results within the next fortnight and I will include them in the calculations for prizes and promotions.

| 317 | C. Almarza-Mato | C. Dowell | 316 (2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | D.R. Cumming | 166 (2) |
| 049 | A. Armstrong | C. Dowell | 316 |
| 155 | R. Beacon | D.R. Cumming | 166 |
|  |  | G. Lloyd | 264 |
| 302 | C. Black | D.R. Cumming | 166 |
| 108 | J. Cassidy | D.R. Cumming | 166 |
|  |  | R.B. Crosbie | 233 |
| 233 | R.B. Crosbie | C. Hammersley | 327 (2) |
|  |  | J. Cassidy | 108 (2) |
| 166 | D.R. Cumming | C. Almarza-Mato | 313 (2) |
|  |  | R. Beacon | 155 |
|  |  | J. Cassidy | 108 |
|  |  | C. Black | 302 |
| 316 | C. Dowell | S. Robinson | 319 (2) |
|  |  | A. Armstrong | 319 (2) |
|  |  | C. Almarza-Mato | 317 |
| 341 | J. Dunnett | A.R. Petrie | 315 |
| 219 | M.P. Ford | G. Lloyd | 264 |
| 327 | C. Hammersley | M. May | 199 |
|  |  | R.B. Crosbie | 233 (2) |
| 312 | C.R. James | G. Plant | 229 |
| 264 | G. Lloyd | R. Beacon | 155 |
|  |  | M.P. Ford | 219 |
| 330 | A. Madden | G. Plant | 229 (2) |
| 199 | M. May | C. Hammersley | 327 |
| 315 | A.R. Petrie | J. Dunnett | 341 |
| 229 | G. Plant | A. Madden | 330 (2) |
|  |  | C.R. James | 312 |
| 319 | S. Robinson | C. Dowell | 316 (2) |



## OVERSEAS SUBSCRIBERS

Subscription for one year's editions of the Scottish CCA Magazine can be obtained from the Editor for $£ 15$, or £25 for 2 years (inclusive of postage). Payments in $£$ sterling, please!

## $\equiv$ Address Changes?

Members are asked to advise changes of address promptly to their opponents, the tournament secretary, the Scottish CCA Secretary and the Editor of the SCCA Magazine.

## SCOTTISH CCA LEAGUE 1996

DIVISION 1 (Controller-A. Nisbet)

| A | BOURNE END | BUCKS | $41 / 2$ | B | KIRKCALDY KING |  | $71 / 2$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | J Watson | v E1 | 11 | 1 | G D Pyrich | $v$ D1 | 11 |
| 2 | R De Coverly | v D2 | $01 / 2$ | 2 | T Thomson | v C2 | $11 / 2$ |
| 3 | A Reed | v C3 | $1 / 21$ | 3 | A Burnett | vF3 | $1 / 21 / 2$ |
| 4 | E Tweeddale | v B4 | $1 / 20$ | 4 | I Marshall | v A4 | $11 / 2$ |
| 5 | E Bolduc | vF5 | 00 | 5 | S Donohoe | vE5 | 1/21 |
| C | LEWIS CHESS CLUB "A" 41/2 |  |  | D | PERTH CORRESP | OND | TS 4 |
| 1 | A MacLeod | v F1 | 1/21/2 | 1 | A P Borwell | $v$ B1 | 00 |
| 2 | M J MacLeod | v B2 | $01 / 2$ | 2 | I Mackintosh | v A2 | $11 / 2$ |
| 3 | R Malcolmson | $v$ A3 | $1 / 20$ | 3 | J N Falconer | vE3 | 11 |
| 4 | C Wallace | v E4 | 10 | 4 | D Harvey | vF4 | 00 |
| 5 | R Swiergala | v D5 | $1 / 21$ | 5 | I W S Mitchell | v C5 | $1 / 20$ |
| E | GIFFNOCK \& CLARKSTON $11 / 2$ |  |  | F | BLACK KNIGHT | 8 |  |
| 1 | C F Boyle | v AI | 00 |  | C R Beecham | vCl | $1 / 21 / 2$ |
| 2 | I S Campbell | vF2 | 00 | 2 | G R Sprott | vE2 | 11 |
| 3 | R A Giulian | $v$ D3 | 00 | 3 | R Kilpatrick | $v$ B3 | $1 / 21 / 2$ |
| 4 | W E Leithead | $\checkmark \mathrm{C} 4$ | 01 | 4 | IF Reeman | v D4 | 11 |
| 5 | A MacQueen | $v$ B5 | $1 / 20$ | 5 | A T Hislop | v A5 | 11 |

DIVISION 2 (Controller-J.P.E. Jack)

| A | A FIVE BRAVE ENGLISHMEN $71 / 2$ |  |  | B BRUTAL REALISM |  |  | 51/2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | D J R Barnes | vEI | 10 | 1 | J S Murray | $v$ D1 | $11 / 2$ |
| 2 | A N Morris | $v$ D2 | 11 | 2 | A Thomson | $v \mathrm{C} 2$ | 11 |
| 3 | K Champion | v C3 | 11 | 3 | P Coffield | v F3 | 11 |
| 4 | R W Goosey | v B4 | 11 | 4 | W Taylor | v A4 | 00 |
| 5 | A J C Rawlings | vF5 | $1 / 20$ | 5 | S Brady | vE5 | 00 |
| C | CASTLEHILL 1 |  |  | D | SUPERKINGS | $61 / 2$ |  |
| 1 | C A Wilman | v F1 | 11 | 1 | A C Brown | $v \mathrm{Bl}$ | $01 / 2$ |
| 2 | D R Reid | v $\mathrm{B}^{2}$ | 00 | 2 | A Armstrong | v A2 | 00 |
| 3 | R E Clapham | $v \mathrm{~A} 3$ | 00 | 3 | M Keen | v E3 | 11 |
| 4 | D L Kleppang | vE4 | 11 | 4 | B Milligan | v F4 | 11 |
| 5 | J Wilman | v D5 | 00 | 5 | R Crosbie | v C5 | 11 |


| E EDINBURGH WEST |  |  | 3 | F | DUNDEE \& | RIA | $31 / 2$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | S R Gillam | v A1 | 01 | 1 | F Stevenson | vCl | 00 |
| 2 | B McEwan | vF2 | 00 | 2 | R Burnett | v E2 | 11 |
| 3 | W Grant | vD3 | 00 | 3 | M Munro | v B3 | 00 |
| 4 | A Seywright | $v \mathrm{C} 4$ | 00 | 4 | C Ironside | $v$ D4 | 00 |
| 5 | S M Young | v B5 | 11 | 5 | N Ferrie | v A5 | 1/21 |

## DIVISION 3 (Controller - I. Sneddon)

| A CASTLEHILL 2 |  |  |  | B BUSMAN'S HOLIDAY |  |  | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | C A Strong | v E1 | 00 | 1 | S Collins | $v$ D1 | 00 |
| 2 | R Noble | $v$ D2 |  | 2 | A R Petrie | $\mathrm{vC2}$ | 1/21/2 |
| 3 | R Gow | v C3 | 01 | 3 | C Dowell | vF3 | 10 |
| 4 | MM Chalmers | vB4 | 11 | 4 | T Thompson | v A4 | 00 |
| 5 | R J Lockhart | vF5 | 00 | 5 | A Madden | vE5 | 00 |

C THE SOCIAL EAGLES
1 GE Wallwork vF
VF1 1 B Jenkins vBl 11
$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { MJ Gifford } & v B 21 / 21 / 2 & 2 & \text { IPetrie } & \text { v A2 }\end{array}$
3 JR Richards vA3 10 3 A MacDonald vE3
$\begin{array}{llllllll}4 & \text { D Gleed } & \text { VE4 } & 0 & 4 & \text { SK McInroy } & \text { VF4 } & \\ 5 & \text { S Hilton } & \text { vD5 } & 01 & 5 & \text { JI Coltart } & \text { vC5 } & 10\end{array}$
E CATHCART F KIRKINTILLOCH PLUS FOUR
1 DM Livie
2 GW GLivi
vA1 111 RF Turner $\quad v \mathrm{Cl}$
3 MHarkins $\quad$ VD3 $11 / 2 \quad 2$ W Harper $\quad$ VE2 $01 / 2$
JNarkins vD3 $\quad 3$ DR Cumming vB3 01
5 A Maxwell vB5 11 5 A Hind vA5 11



The ICCF President, Mr. H.J. Mostert (NLD), retires at $31 / 12 / 96$ but, sadly, he suffered a stroke several weeks ago. However, we are glad to hear that he is progressing well in a Haarlem hospital and the Scottish CCA sends him best wishes for a full and speedy recovery.

Mr. Mostert was elected as ICCF Honorary President at the 1996 Congress.

## Electronic Move Transmission

[by Bernard Milligan]

Alan Borwell's recent article on fax and Email chess prompted Anthony Roberts to enquire if it was permissible for players to use this means of sending moves in our normal domestic tournaments, such as the Minors, Majors and Premiers. Strictly speaking, these tournaments are intended for postal transmission. However, there is no objection to players using other means of transmitting their moves, provided both players agree.

Having discussed this at our last Committee meeting, some concern was raised as to the available reflection time when using fax or Email. When moves are posted, players have several days to think about the position before their opponent's reply is received. With electronic transmission, it is quite possible that you will receive a reply on the same day that you send your move. This could result in more pressure on the players and a possible deterioration in the quality of the moves selected.

To combat this, it was agreed where players agree to use electronic transmission that the date of receipt would be one day after the date of transmission. Of course this does not mean that where a player still replies on the same day as the electronic transmission they will be allowed to deduct one day from their total reflection time, simply because they have sent their reply one day before they officially received their opponent's move. In this instance, they will simply have made a same day reply and their previous total reflection time will remain unaltered.
Where players do agree to use electronic transmission, the normal rules and time controls for that tournament will still apply. The one exception will be that scorecards will not be sent back and forth. Each player must, therefore, send the following details with each move:-

1. the tournament the game is being played in
2. the name of the player sending the move
3. the official date of receipt of your opponent's move
4. the date you sent your reply
5. your reflection time for that move
6. your total reflection time for all your moves to date
7. your opponent's total reflection time
8. the move you are playing.

If a move is received without all of the above information, then the receiver should simply reply to his opponent, asking for him to re-send the move with the complete details. They need not send a reply move until this is received correctly. Either player shall have the right at any time to suspend electronic transmission and have the game continued by normal postal transmission.

The Scottish CCA can arrange intemational participation in Fax or Email toumaments. Details of these can be obtained from George Pyrich.
On the other hand, if you would like to take part in a domestic Fax or Email tournament, then write and let me know. My address is at the front of the magazine. Please include your Fax and/or Email address. If enough members ask to take part, then we will start a tournament as soon as possible.
$\mathrm{Bl}_{\mathbf{S}}$ ' $\mathrm{n}^{\prime} \mathrm{PII}_{\mathrm{I}}^{E_{\mathrm{c}}} \mathbf{e} S$

## hy ian marks

> "I turned on the set hoping to see more rain, but instead found Nastase on his hands and knees banging his head against the turf. Then he had a lengthy conversation with the electronic eye, a machine which threatens to crab his act, since he will be able to dispute no more line calls."

> Clive James in The Observer, 1980

Cheating apart, there isn't a lot of scope in CC for extreme behaviour. Almost without exception my opponents have been unfailingly courteous and, in general, the stronger the player, the greater the sportsmanship. Twice US Junior Open Champion, Missouri State Champion and OTB FM, St Louis's Doug Eckert is not only a class act, but also a true sportsman. The game below is one of the most enjoyable I've ever played.

## WT/M/GT/344, 1994-96

White: Ian Marks (SCO), 2160
Black: Doug Eckert (USA), 2280

## Vienna Game C27

## 1 e4

e5!
Doug is a Sicilian man, but in a 1990 interview in The Chess Connection, he says "I need to widen my opening repertoire. I never play double king pawn as Black. All the great players in history have played double king pawn openings well. Double king pawn is more solid than the Sicilian and 1 feel very necessary to be properly armed for a higher level of play." So here he is practising what he preaches!

## 2 Nc3!

I figured that with Doug still breaking in $1 \ldots$ e5, he would have spent most of his time mugging up on the Ruy Lopez. Why give him the opportunity to play what he's expecting?

I actually got interested in the Vienna 20-odd years ago when I discovered the games of Rudolf Spielmann, so I think I've a reasonable idea of what I'm doing. Jack Spence did a nice little trilogy of the Austrian's games, now long out of print, but well worth scouring the second-hand dealers for.

## 2

Nf6

Spielmann usually preferred $3 \mathrm{f4}$, but that has long since been shorn of its terrors. 3 Bc 4 is sharper and contains a lot more pitfalls for the unwary.

$$
3 \text {..... }
$$

## Nxe4

Doug heads straight for the sharpest line.

| 4 | Qh5 | Nd6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | Bb3 |  |

In Suttles-Tarjan, Venice 1975, The Divine One played 5 Qxe5+ Qe7 6 Qxe7+ Bxe7 7 Bb3 Nf5 and eventually 1-0. In his (unpublished, but they're lying in my drawer) notes, Suttles gives 5 Qxe5+ a ! and comments "A little chess psychology at work. Black needed $a$ win to have a chance for the GM norm."

## 5 <br> ..... <br> Nc6

5 ... Be7 6 Qxe5 0-0 7 Nge2 Nc6 8 Qf4 b5 9 d3 Bb7 10 0-0 Bf6 11 Ng 3 Be 512 Qg 4 Nd 413 Bg 5 Qc 8 14 f4 1-0! (Marks-White, CC 1974) is an example of how quickly things can go wrong for Black. (14 ... Nxb3 15 fxe5 Nxal 16 exd6 Nxc2 17 Bf6 g6 18 Nf5!)

| $\mathbf{6}$ | Nb5 | g6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7 | Qf3 | f5 |

Not forced. It has never been proved that 7 ... Nf5 necessarily loses, although 8 Qd5 Nh6 $\square 9 \mathrm{~d} 3$ (d4!?) d6 10 Bxh6 Be6 11 Bg5 Bxd5 12 Bxd8 Bxg2 13 Bf6 with advantage for White, is generally reckoned superior to the messy 8 g 4 a6 (Nh6 $9 \mathrm{~d} 4 \Delta$ Bxh6) 9 gxf5 axb5 10 fxg6 Qe7! $\square$ (f6 $11 \mathrm{~g} 7!\mathrm{Bxg} 712 \mathrm{Qh} 5+\mathrm{Ke} 713$ Qf7+ and 14 Qxg7) $11 \mathrm{gxf} 7+\mathrm{Kd8}$ of the well-known game TartakowerSpielmann, Ostende 1907.

And there's more, e.g. $7 \ldots$ Nf5 8 g 4 e4!? 9 Qf4 (Qxe4+ Qe7! [not Nfe7? 10 Qf4 +-, threatening two mates and two B7s!] 10 Nxc7+ Kd8 11 Qxe7+ Nfxe7 12 Nxa8 b6 13 Bxf7 Bb 7 , interesting/unclear) Bd6 10 Qxe4+ Qe7 11 Qxe7+ Nfxe7 12 Nxd6+ with advantage.

Still not done! 7 ... f6!? has been championed by - who else? Bronstein. Now 8 Qd5 leads to positions analagous to the main line, but White also has $8 \mathrm{Nxc} 7+$ !? Qxc7 9 Qxf6 b6, when 10 Nf 3 is generally considered better than the 10 Qxh8 Bb7 11 Qxh7 0-0-0 of MukhinBronstein, Moscow 1959. There's a touch of the Latvian Gambit about the position. Black (or at least a Bronstein!) has compensation.


The irrationalist within me says that White should be winning easily. The realist tells me there's still a long way to go.
10 ...
b6
11 d3

I had this position as long ago as January 1973 against Stephen Swanson in the Scottish Individual League Championship. In that game I played 11 Nxb6, although sometimes the tempo Black has to spend on recapturing the knight can be worth more than the extra pawn.


Did you notice the threat!?

| 13 | Qf3 | Bh6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | Bd2 | Nd4 |

14... e4 at once is also possible.

## $15 \quad$ Qg4

Or 16 ... exd3, but this promises more action. For someone new to 1... e5, Doug has handled the main line with suspicious aplomb.

## 17 fxe3 Nxb3+

17 ... fxe3 18 Qxd4 exd2+ 19 Kb 1 looks like a white advantage: 19 ... Rf8 20 Nxb6 axb6 21 Qxb6+.


Not mentioned by Nunn and Griffiths in Secrets of Grandmaster Play (now there's a good book). They think that 20 ... Bxa8 at once "is a good moment to take time out for burying the knight since White has no serious threats." Doug disagrees. He thinks that 20 ... Bxa8 is "probably insufficient" and calls N \& G's notes "somewhat misleading regarding their conclusion to that line.". You pays your money.....

| 21 | Nf3 | Bxa8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | Ng5!? |  |

To block the effect of the Bh6. Doug later suggested 22 h 5 !? - "White might be better but it is tricky." I hadn't considered it fully. One idea: 22 h 5 Bxf3!? 23 Qxf3 Bxd2+ (no?) $24 \mathrm{Kxd} 2 \mathrm{~g} 5!$ ? and I cop out with 'unclear'. I suspect Black is O.K.

```
22 .....
Nf5
23 Bf2
```

If you've enjoyed playing international opponents in friendly matches, then why not try an ICCF event? Details are given in the blue entry form which is enclosed with this magazine.

## 28 Rxe1

The flashy desperado 28 Qxd7+! Kxd7 29 Rxel Nxg2 30 Rhl might be a better idea. I thought what I played was all right too.

| 28 | .... | Nxg4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 29 | Rh1 | Ke8 |

? From Doug, who hadn't seen my next move. Doug suggests that 29 ... Ne5 30 Rxh7 Bxg2 31 Rg 7 Bd5 is " $a$ clear draw, even if I have to suffer a little," ... Bxg2 at the moment is met by $\mathrm{Rg} 1 \mathrm{Bf} 3 / \mathrm{h} 3$ and Rg 3 .

## 30 Kd2 Bd5

Amanda Jeanine Eckert arrived safely at this stage of the proceedings. These are the little nuggets you never really pick up on OTB.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
31 & \text { c } & \text { Be6 }
\end{array}
$$

The passive 31 ... Bg8 is a nonstarter. One idea then is 32 Ral as 33 b4!


| 32 | d4 | Nf2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 33 | Rxh7 | Ne4+ |
| 34 | Ke3 | Nxg5 |

The postmarks reveal that $34 \ldots$.. Nxg5 left St Louis, Missouri, on 31 July, arrived in Springfield, Illinois, on 1 August, then headed west to Fort Scott, Kansas, where it caught its breath from 10-12 August (where was it in between times?) in readiness for the hop across the Atlantic, all of which proves that the postal service has a fantastic sense of humour.

| 35 | Rh8 | Ke7 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 36 | d5 |  |  |

36 Ra 8 a5 37 Ra 6 d 5 !?

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
36 & \ldots . . & \text { Bf5 } \\
37 & \text { Ra8 } & \text { Kd6!? }
\end{array}
$$

Big Decision, but probably correct. Black aims for maximum activity and coordination. If $37 \ldots$ a5 38 Ra6 wins a pawn more favourably.

## 38 Rxa7 <br> Ke5

Doug had originally intended 38 ... Kc5, then (curses!) noticed $39 \mathrm{~g} 4!$ ("and 1-0" - Doug). 39 g 4 Bc 240 Rxd7 Bxb3 41 Rc7+ Kd6 42 Rc6+ Kd7 43 Rxg6 looks persuasive.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
39 & \text { Rb7 } & \text { Ne4 } \\
40 & \text { Rxb6 } & \text { Nf6 }
\end{array}
$$



## 41 Rxf6!?

Doug assumed I had analysed this out to a win. I hadn't. My reasoning was that Black has done all the right things for a R v B \& N ending: he's centralised his pieces, got them cooperating and they control good squares. After the impending ... $\mathrm{Ng} 4+$, I thought Black would hold comfortably, while after Rxf6, White has no losing chances. But maybe I should just have continued to manoeuvre.

| 41 | $\cdots .$. | Kxf6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 42 | Kd4 | d6 |

Pity about this!

| 43 | b4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 44 | b5!? |

Ke7

If c4-c5 at any time, Black of course doesn't take (wish it was draughts!), so we get a sort of balance: c5xd6 isolates the pawns, while c5-c6 allows a blockade and the white king can't get in. Equal.

| 44 | $\ldots .$. | Kd7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 45 | b6 | Kc8 |
| 46 | b4 |  |

The last try．White＇s only problem is that if the king heads for g 5 （use all the pieces！），then Black gets in Bf5－ e4xd5．Doug ensures the draw with a neat little manoeuvre．

| 46 | … | Kb7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 47 | c5 | Bc8（！） |
| 48 | Ke4 |  |

48 Kc 4 makes no difiference．

| 48 | ．．．．． | Ka6（！） |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 49 | cxd6 |  |

．．．Kb5 might even be awkward．


Exactly the same result that Judy Polgar got against Doug in the 1987 New York Open．

One possible pretty finish would be $50 \mathrm{Ke} 5 \mathrm{~Kb} 551 \mathrm{Kf6} \mathrm{Kxb} 452 \mathrm{Ke} 7$ （Kxg6 Kc5）Kc5 53 d7 Bxd7 $54 \mathrm{Kxd} 7 \mathrm{Kxd} 555 \mathrm{Ke} 7 \mathrm{Ke} 556 \mathrm{Kf7}$ Kf5（g5 $57 \mathrm{Kg} 6 \mathrm{Kf} 458 \mathrm{~g} 3+!\mathrm{Kg} 4$ $59 \mathrm{Kf6} \Rightarrow 57 \mathrm{~g} 4+!\mathrm{Kg} 5!58 \mathrm{Kg} 7!$

## 2

## ＂YOUR＂ASSOCIATION

If you have any ideas or suggestions about improving or developing the Scottish CCA，we would be very pleased to hear from you．Just write to one of the Office Bearers（addresses on inside of front cover）．

## 100 CLUB

This is a club for members who would like to help with the development of the Scottish Correspondence Chess Association． Currently there are almost 80 units issued but we need to increase this to 100 －please help us！

The subscription is only $£ 1$ per month per unit，with two prizes each month currently approx $£ 24$ and $£ 16$ respectively－members may apply for more than one unit if they so wish！

A monthly bankers order form can be obtained from our Treasurer，David Kilgour，＂Willowbank＂，Peebles Road， Galashiels，TD1 1TH．If you return it to him before the 10th of the month，then you will be eligible to be in the draw for that month．

Recent winners：

| September： | G．McKnight <br> G．E．Wallwork |
| :--- | :--- |
| October | A．J．McClelland <br> G．W．G．Livie |
| November： | G．D．Pyrich <br> C．R．Beecham |

## OVERSEAS SUBSCRIBERS

Subscription for one year＇s editions of the Scottish CCA Magazine can be obtained from the Editor for $£ 15$ ，or $£ 25$ for 2 years（inclusive of postage）．Payment in £ sterling，please！

# Annmotated Gamme for the ＂IImprovingg IPlayyer＂ 

［by Alan Borwell，IM］

We have received several requests for annotators to provide a greater insight into the considerations，both positional and tactical，which are in a player＇s mind during a game，rather than simply giving detailed analysis of alternative variations．In other words，to describe the strategic and judgemental thinking whereby certain moves are simply＂not considered＂by stronger players．On the other hand，there are often other ＂candidate＂moves which are considered but then discarded for reasons which may not be clear to less strong players．
To start the ball rolling，I have selected a game which I played recently in the first ever ICCF Email Master Class Section．I hope other Scottish players will follow my example and provide games annotated in a similar way for future editions of our members＇magazine！

White：Paul S．Bratholm（DEN） 2145 Black：Alan P．Borwell（SCO） 2385
English Opening A21
1 c 4
This opening move provides White with flexibility and transpositions into other openings are common，e．g． a later d4 into Queen＇s Gambit or Indian Defences．

[^1]Black also has numerous options，for example 1 ．．．c5 with a symmetrical structure，or 1 ．．．公 $\mathrm{f} 6 / \mathrm{g} 6$ with a King＇s Indian formation．My preference is for unbalanced pawn structures in openings，to provide more dynamic and tactical games． However，it is always necessary to consider the positional implications， even in open positions！

## 2 公 $\mathbf{c} 3$

In many variations of the English， the key square for White to control is d5，usually with the c4 pawn，公c3 and bishop fianchetto on g2．Black must try to disrupt this strategy by establishing counterplay and prevent White obtaining a positional bind， based on strong central control．

$$
2 \quad . . . .
$$

§b4
A relatively recent concept whereby Black intends to exchange white运c3 for his black－squared B． Having played $1 \ldots$ e 5 ，this $\&$ is not so effective on the $\mathrm{g} 7 / \mathrm{al}$ diagonal and tends to get in the way on e7．

| 3 | g3 | ふxc3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 | bxc3 | d6 |
| 5 | ふg2 | 2e7 |

White has accepted a double pawn on the c－file but expects to advance the front one to eliminate the short－term weakness．

In a recent game between Julian Hodgson and Lev Psakhis，Black played an early 5 ．．．f5 and White played 6 c5！immediately，gaining a good position．

## 6 Eb1

There are several other options for White in this position，e．g． 6 e4 or 2 f 3 ．The idea of the move played is to try to take early advantage of the half－open b－file and restrict Black＇s queenside development．

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
6 & \ldots . . & \text { 台bc6 }
\end{array}
$$

This is a very instructive situation．It would seem obvious that Black should now either exchange this pawn or seek to advance it to e4． However，a black pawn advance to e4 is rather difficult to support and the square $\mathrm{f4}$ becomes a very useful slot for a white 2 ．


A multi－purpose and rather subtle move，with designs on the e8／h5 or e8／a4 diagonals．

$$
9 \quad 2 \mathrm{e} 2
$$

## 205

Immediately taking the offensive， before White has castled，and＂asking the questions＂already about White＇s c4 square．

| 10 | $c 5$ | ミd7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | cxd6 | cxd6 |

White has eliminated the double pawn，but at what cost to his development？

$$
12 \text { Ba3? \&c4 }
$$

White＇s move invited this occupation，which was coming anyway．Now he has to try to justify the \＆on the a3／f8 diagonal．．．．．．．

$$
13 \text { 前c1 ふc6 }
$$

The only danger to Black is White＇s KB and therefore it is entirely logical to try to exchange it，then consolidate the powerful 公 on c4．

$$
14 \quad \text { e4 }
$$

f5！
Giving White no time to castle or regroup，now he has to close the centre at a time when he is not well placed on the flanks．

| 15 | d5 | \＆b5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 16 | f3 | fxe4 |
| 17 | fxe4 |  |

The white $\dot{-2}$ is stranded in the centre，both \＆s are inactive and the 2 has no squares to try to make an impact．


$$
17 \text {..... a6! }
$$

There is no need to rush this kind of position，simply increasing the bind is the best strategy．Black wishes to prepare for the ${ }_{g}$ entry but first secures the queenside．White is almost in a kind of zugzwang（i．e． there is no good move or plan）．

| 18 | 宜b4 | 쓰f7！ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 19 | 昌f1 | 씀 h 5 |

Now Black has a discovered threat on e2（i．e．分xa3 opens the ${ }_{\circ}{ }^{\mu}$ and $\delta$ attack）and the h and g －pawns are doomed．Exchange of Es by White simply surrenders the f－file as well． For example，if $20 ~ \$ b 2$ 쓰N 21 ふf3 分xb2 22 Mxb2 及xe2 23 씅 xe 2 쓸 $\mathrm{xg} 2+24$ 安d2 b5（or the quieter $(\mathrm{Bb} 8)$ followed by the 公 entry to f 4 and advance of the h － pawn is only a matter of time and simple technique．Therefore，my sporting Danish opponent decided to resign，rather than struggle on to an inevitable conclusion．

In summary，Black＇s strategy in this game was to take advantage of a lead in development by active play on both sides of the board and committing White to purely short－ term expediencies and defence of material．Often in the English Opening，the fortunes are reversed with White having the positional bind in the centre and being able to exploit opportunities on either side of the board．The outcome of a game of chess often hinges upon only a couple of inaccuracies early in the game and thereafter（especially at correspond－ ence chess）recovery can be impossible．


## ICCF World Champ＇ship Final XV

 ＂In Memoriam Prof Dr Vladimir Zagorovsky＂1．F．Finocchairo（ITA）
2．M．Prizant（ENG）
3．A．Poulsen（DEN）
4．J．J．van Oosterom（NLD）
5．G．J．Timmerman（NLD）
6．A．V．Sichev（RUS）
7．R．I．Reynolds（USA）
8．T．Cayford（USA）
9．V．V．Tomkovich（RUS）
10，D．A．Kilgour（SCO）
11．G．Gottardi（SWZ）
12．J．Vitomskis（SWZ）
13．Yu．E．Shteynsapir（RUS）
14．J．Barlow（RSA）
15．V．Maes（BEL）
16．V．Gefenas（LIT）
17 J．Carleton（ENG）

## The Complete c3 Sicilian <br> by Murray Chandler <br> 239 pages, $£ 14.99$

This is a welcome update on earlier books covering this effective way of avoiding the many complexities of the vast range of Sicilian variants. It remains popular at top level, with both John Nunn and Judit Polgar being amongst its proponents. There is always a danger in the use of the designation "Complete" as it is virtually impossible to cover all lines of any opening. However, this is a comprehensive and up-to-date book, using 70 main games, with detailed analysis of main and sub variations. Well compiled and indexed.

An essential for Sicilian players and also for those looking for a method of good repute to use as White to combat the Sicilian. Recommended

| Endgame Play |
| :---: |
| by Chris Ward |
| 128 pages, $£ 10.99$ |

A useful introductory book for beginners and players wishing to obtain a better understanding of basic endgame play. Plenty of descriptive comment and advice makes this a readable book, rather than one of heavy analysis.

## Understanding the Spanish <br> by Shaun Taulbut <br> 144 pages, $£ 12.99$

Just arrived - a useful introduction to this ever popular and most famous of all chess openings.

## Beating the Anti-King's Indians by Joe Gallagher <br> 191 pages, £14.99

Many of us will have tried over the years to avoid the combative King's Indian Defence, especially against players renowned for their tactical expertise.
In recent times, I have tried Trompowsky, Torre Attack, Veresov and even the extreme Blackmar-Diemer Gambit - none with much success! This book has the audacity to try to even destroy the hopes of players striving to "find something good" for White against the dreaded King's Indian. Recommended.

```
Attacking Technique
by Colin Crouch
105 pages, \(£ 9.99\)
```

This book is designed to help players to convert advantages into full points. It uses examples of exploiting opponents' weaknesses, launching attacks, handling desperate counterplay, knowing when to exchange into winning endgames, etc.
The 20 quiz positions at the end of the book are quite interesting and instructive.

```
Capablanca's Best Games by Harry Golombeck 288 pages, \(£ 16.99\)
```

Just arrived - algebraic reprint of book dedicated to arguably the most classic of all chess players.

A Guide to Attacking Chess
by Gary Lane
128 pages, $£ 10.99$
Although carrying a similar title to the previous book, this one is designed to teach the creation and execution of successful attacks. Chapters cover Storming the King, The Stranded King, Sacrifice!, The King Hunt, Typical Mates and Essential Endgames.

## The Chigorin Queen's Gambit <br> by Angus Dunnington <br> 160 pages, $£ 13.99$

A welcome addition to opening theory books covering 1 d 4 d 52 c 4 Nc 6 . For surprise value and avoidance of heavily analysed QG variations, this active black counter-attack is well worth a try at postal chess!

## The Dutch for the Attacking Player by Steffen Pederson 160 pages, $£ 13.99$

Another rather neglected defence in modern times, although the Leningrad Variation has been adopted by some leading GMs. More than half the pages in this book cover the Leningrad but there are also interesting pages on 2 Bg5, the Staunton Gambit 2 e4, and unusual second moves like $2 \mathrm{g4}$. It also covers the Dutch Gambit $1 \mathrm{c4}$ and 1 Nf3.


I have to admit to an aversion to "gimmick" titles, but Paul's first book for Batsfords on Highly Original Thinking is excellent. If you can accept (or ignore) the acronym-based concept, then there are lots of good tips and advice contained in its pages! It is very readable, lots of diagrams and some instructive games.

Indeed the highest accolade I can give this book is that Moira has been waxing lyrically about it ever since the review copy arrived!
Well done, Paul.

## Das angenommene Königsgambit

 by Alexander Bangiev 160 pages, DM28.80Available from Reinhold Dreier, Seydlitzstr. 13, 67061 Ludwigshafen, Germany. Fax +496215889722

## Chess Digest

 (new)
## Modern Chess Lessons

by IM Eric Tangborn
86 pages, $£ 11.95$
See page 80 for full list of Chess Digest titles available from Qualitext Business Services

## Cadogan Chess Books

As a prelude to the specific reviews, may I say that it is a pleasure to see Cadogan now producing chess books with more attractiveness to correspondence chess players. Keep up the good work, Murray!

## The Modern French Tarrasch by Edward Gufeld <br> 144 pages, £12.99

The book focuses on the main line 1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Nd2 c5 4 exd5 Qxd5. There is brief coverage of $4 \mathrm{dxc5}, 4 \mathrm{c} 3$ and 22 pages on $4 \mathrm{Ngf3}$.
There are 52 illustrative games and Ken Neat has achieved another excellent translation of the Russian GM's text. An excellent index of both Games and Variations.

| Chess Explorations <br> by Edward Winter <br> 343 pages, $£ 14.99$${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: |

A collection of the author's famous Chess Notes published around the world for more than a decade. Colourful and chatty on all aspects of chess, past and present, humorous and original material.

The Queen's Indian Defence
by Bogdan Lalic
208 pages, $£ 14.99$
Continuing the series of excellent recent books on the Indian Defences, this provides excellent up-to-date coverage of an ever-popular defence. There are almost 100 pages on the Petrosian System 2 a 3 and 70 pages on the Fianchetto System 4 g3, but only 12 on the Classical 4 e 3.

## King's Indian Defence <br> Averbakh Variation <br> by Margeir Petursson <br> 128 pages, $£ 12.99$

Introduced to international tournament play some 45 years ago, this variation has been popular ever since. With $5 \mathrm{Be} 20-06 \mathrm{Bg} 5$, White sets out to combat the King's Indian with sound positional strategy, based on central control and restraint of counterplay on the flanks. Maybe this is the best antidote, rather than those covered in the earlier books reviewed!?

## Practical Endgame Play <br> by Neil McDonald <br> 155 pages, £12.99

The author claims to "provide a fresh approach to endgame play," concentrating on practical aspects that all players will find useful. I may be old-fashioned but I still have this opinion about Reuben Fine's masterpiece! The main problem with many endgames is that you don't often find them in any modern book, and this one is no exception.

## Thinker's Press

## Guide to Good Chess <br> by C.J.S. Purdy <br> 143 pages, $£ 9.99$

This is the 11th reprint of this fine book written by the first World Correspondence Chess Champion from Australia. Edited by Dr. Ralph J. Tykodi, algebraic notation has been used for the first time. (Will No. 12 be in figurine!?)

The advice contained is both instructive and simple in its exposition. Chapters on How to Play Openings Well and Where to Put your Pieces are worth revisiting even by stronger players, especially for postal chess purposes.

## Journal of a Chess Original by Stephan Gerzadowicz 164 pages, $£ 11.99$

This extraordinary author keeps on producing entertaining and original material, with the usual wealth of literary quotations. There are 13 games played by the author in the 8th US CC Championship Finals, others from the USCF 88 Absolute and the Gerzadowicz Cup!!

Stephan's CC rating is 2320 but is much higher as an annotator and creative writer!

> All chess books for Scottish CCA Members/Magazine Subscribers $10 \%$ discount and free postage from Qualitext Business Services (see end of magazine)

## Chess Informant

No. 67
expected shortly $£ 19.95$
New Openings Monographs received recently

- Volga Gambit (A57), Karpov
- Sicilian Richter (B67-69), Van der Wiel

All Chess Informant publications are available from Qualitext Business Services (with Members/Subscribers discount). See advert for details.

## Trends Openings Booklets

New titles received recently:-

- King's Indian Sämisch V. 3 -B. Lalic
-g3 Grünfeld, Vol 2 - D. Cummings
See elsewhere in magazine for complete listing of available titles.



## CHESS SUPPLIERS SCOTLAND

Visit Chess Suppliers Scotland on the first floor, 15 Hope Street, Glasgow G2 6AQ Te/Fax : 0141-248-2887 (24 Hrs)
You are welcome to drop in and browse through Scotiand's largest display of chess pablications, compaters, software, chess sets and other accessories. If we haven't got it in stock we will get it for yoa!
The location in Hope Street is opposite Glasgow Central Station. We look forward to seeing you here.


Opening Hours
11.00 am-5.30pm Twesday to Friday 9.30am -5.30pm Saturday

## Avaïble now-

CHESS COMPUIERS: MEPHISTO. NOVAG • 100 S of BOOKS and MAGAZINES • CHESS SEIS (plastictwood) - CHESSBOARDS • CHESS CLOCKS • TRAVEL CHESS SETS • SPECIALIST IN ALL CHESSBASE PRODUCTS • Pop in for friendly advice before you buy Devasatingly powerful chess software Chess Genins 3. Fritz 3, MCHIESS, Fiares-
Try Before You Bay at the biggest dedicated chess shop in Scotiand.
Post Free! Post Free! Pest Free! Post Free! Don't worry if you camot make it along to the showroom - we will gladly send out your order free of all postage.
$\mathbf{5 \%}$ discount to members of the Scottish Chess Association


We start the Games Section this time with three games provided by Scotland's newest CC Grandmaster, including a very important victory in the XI Olympiad Final against a tough American opponent.

NATT 4, 1995/6
White: D.A. Kilgour (SCO)
Black: P.A. Richmond (WLS)
Sicilian - Sveshnikov B33

| 1 | e4 | c5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 213 | 2c6 |
| 3 | d4 | cxd4 |
| 4 | $2 \mathrm{xd4}$ | 2f6 |
| 5 | 2 c 3 | e5 |
| 6 | 20db5 | d6 |
| 7 | Bg5 | a6 |
| 8 | 203 | b5 |
| 9 | 2 d 5 |  |

This is the first time I have played this variation. The other "main line" involves playing 8 ßxf6.

| 9 |
| :---: |
|  |  |

## 11 c3

White has a number of alternatives to c3, including \&d3, ße2, h4 and分xf6 but I think that c3 is probably best.

## 11 <br> 20

0-0

The idea of c 3 is to bring the a3 2 2 over to e 3 or b 4 and gain control over the central white squares. Black will try to stop any bind by exchanging knights but this involves either queenside or kingside weaknesses.

| 12 | $\ldots .$. | 自b8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 13 | h4 |  |

This is an attempt to stop the black \& getting into play on h 6 -cl diagonal. If Black had played $\& g 5$ on the previous move, 13 a4 opens up the queenside and helps get the white $\Omega$ on c 4 where it will exert pressure on the centre and kingside.

| 13 |  | 2 e 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | 2xf6＋ | gx6 |
| 15 | $3{ }^{\text {d }}$ | d5 |

Black has managed to gain control of the d5 square and opens the centre before White has castled．

| 16 | exd5 | 石 $\times 15$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 | 公 3 | 㮣e6 |
| 18 | 宸 h 5 | f5 |

The black central pawns could become dangerous，so White has to try to find a safe place for his $\dot{g}$ and stop the advance of the black pawns （which is not going to be easy）．

| 19 | 0－0－0 | 쁠g6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | ㅆ．g5 | f6 |
| 21 | 쓸xg6＋ | hxg6 |
| 22 | ふc2 |  |

Up to this point we have been following one of Kasparov＇s games． Black must defend the a2－g8 diagonal and kingside attacks involving h5 and the doubling of rooks on the $h$－file．

| 22 | $\ldots .$. | 目b6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 23 | h5 | f4 |
| 24 | hxg6 | §e6 |
| 25 | Eh7 | fxe3 |
| 26 | Exe7 | exf2 |
| 27 | Ef1 | a5 |
| 28 | a3？ |  |

This is a poor move as it allows the white queenside majority to be held by the black queenside pawns．

| 29 |  | Ed6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30 | 目d2 | 目fd8 |
| 31 | 甼e8＋！ | Exe8 |
| 32 | 昌xd6 | Sc4 |



I would assess the position as slightly better for White but with some winning chances as the black pawns will become weak due to the better placement of the white pieces and the advanced g－pawn．

| 33 | Se4 | 它g7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34 | ¢8d2 | 是 88 |
| 35 | g4 | 安h6 |
| 36 | 惑3 | cig5 |
| 37 | ¢83 | 目 18 |
| 38 | 旬g3 | 日e8 |
| 39 | Sf5 | e4 |
| 40 | 笪d7 |  |

This has the threat of $6 \mathrm{E} 7-\mathrm{h} 5$ mate so Black is almost forced to play the next few moves．

| 40 | … | ふe6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 41 | ふxe6 | 是xe6 |
| 42 | g7 | 日e8 |


| 43 | 回e7 | 日g8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 44 | 目xe4 | 国x7 |
| 45 | 目b4 | Ed7 |

If 45 ．．．目b7 then c 4 gains a tempo on the game．

| 46 | 昌xb5＋ | －¢ ${ }_{\text {g }} 6$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 47 | ¢ ${ }_{\text {¢ }} 4$ | 团d2 |
| 48 | g5！ | fxg5＋ |
| 49 | Exg5＋ | 它f6 |
| 50 | 目b5 |  |
|  | 1 | 0 |

目昌昌昌自
NATT 4，1995／6
White：D．A．Kilgour（SCO）
Black：M．J．Conroy（ENG）
French Winawer C18

| 1 | e4 | e6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | d4 | d5 |
| 3 | 穴c3 | 3 b 4 |
| 4 | e5 | c5 |
| 5 | a3 | Bxc3＋ |
| 6 | bxc3 | 勾 7 |
| 7 | 2f3 | 쓸c7 |

I sometimes play the French as Black so I am quite happy playing this line from either side．

| 8 | a4 | b6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 9 | ふb5 | §d7 |
| 10 | ふd3 |  |

I do not wish to try to recommend which line other players should try here but I prefer the \＆exchange line for Black，although I think Mohrlok， one of my opponents in the $3 / 4$－Final， has been successful with that line．

The idea behind \＆d3 is that the black $\mathbb{B}$ is on the wrong square as Black would like to exchange the white－squared \＆s．Play could go along the following lines： $100-0$ \＄b5 11 axbs a5 12 c 4 2 d 7 and the position is unclear，although White may be better．

| 10 | $\ldots .$. | 各 bc6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | $0-0$ | h6 |

This move has to be played before Black can castle kingside as the $ふ \mathrm{~h} 7+$ sacrifice will win quickly．

## 12 ふa3

The main alternative is 12 el ，as in some of Karpov＇s games from circa 1973.

| 12 | ．．．．． | 家 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 | 退 12 | 0－0 |
| 14 | dxc5 | bxc5 |
| 15 | 包b3 | 公xb3 |
| 16 | cxb3 | f6 |
| 17 | exf6 | Exf6 |
| 18 | b4 |  |

This is a suggestion of Keene from 1972／3 which gave renewed interest in this variation．I have played this in a few OTB games and by CC against Dave Jenkins．He now played 18 exb 4 and found that his position was very difficult to defend but thought that c 4 was better，giving good chances．
18
Bc2
c4
e5！？

I am not sure that the alternatives give White an advantage on the queenside．


20 b5？
Here White should try either 쓸 d 2 or昌el but I thought that my queenside play was going to lead to something， whereas the black kingside attack was a long way away（I was wrong！）

$$
20 \text {..... ふe6 }
$$

Black probably wants to play this move anyway to strengthen his centre and allow the 笪 to come to d8．

21
宣e1？
Here f 3 was much better as this move allows e4 and White is in a bind． The best I could see after e4 was a draw．


This had to be played or e4 followed by Qe5 Eg6 leaves White in a mess．

| 22 | ．．．．． | 甼d8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | Hy1 | Heb ${ }^{\text {H }}$ |
| 24 | 宫h1 | ふ17 |
| 25 | a5 | He6 |

Black has managed to get all his pieces over to the kingside and I have weakened my kingside with f3，but White now has chances of pushing the queenside pawns and defending the kingside with 甼a2 or Be4 in some lines．

$$
26 \text { \&e5 }
$$

公 $h 4$


$$
27 \quad 8 \times 27
$$

Perhaps 27 甼e2 and Hel was best here but there are quite a number of lines to consider．

$$
27 \text {..... 界x3 }
$$

## 28 b

If $28 \ldots$ gxf $\quad$ 쓸 h 3 seems to win．

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
28 & \ldots . . & \text { ̈ㅡg4 } \\
29 & \text { قg1 }
\end{array}
$$

This is the only reasonable move．

$$
29
$$

$$
\ldots .
$$

This is a very good move，trying to bring the $\Omega$ into the game from d5 which will attack g 2 after 是 moves．

## 30 胃 22

I looked at \＄e4 now which stops the black $\&$ coming to d5．There are a vast number of possible moves and lines and I leave the reader to decide if Be4 is any good．

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
30 & \cdots . . & ふ \mathrm{d5} \\
31 & ふ \mathrm{~d} 1 & ふ \mathrm{xg} 2
\end{array}
$$

Moving the to f 4 also has its merits with the intention of playing昌 h3 next．I think the b－pawn just saves White after 31 ．．．堵 $f 4$ ．

| 32 | 甼axg2 | 쓸g2＋ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 33 | 安xg2 | 官e3＋ |
| 34 | \＄f3 | ふxf3＋ |
| 35 | Yif | 目 18 |
| 36 | 莫f1 |  |

I had arrived at this position when considering my 26 \＆c5，but had not thought that it would lead to a draw． However，on reaching this stage，I concluded that it was the inevitable outcome，so．．．．．

David writes，＂Can I introduce the reader to the next game by giving my previous encounter with Joe De Mauro．＂
Horowitz Memorial
White：Joe De Mauro（USA）
Black：David Kilgour（SCO）
English－Symmetrical A35
 4 cxd 5 分xd5 5 e4 2b4 6 及c4
 b4 cxb4 10 合e2 2c7 11 ふb2 e6 12 h 4 分d7 13 d 4 公f6 14 쓸 d 3 a 615 Eel b5 16 \＆b3 \＆b7 17 句f4 H He7 18 d 5 全 d 719 公d4 各 c 520 H h 3 $0-0-021$ dxe6 2 xe4 22 exf7 + 昌d 7 23 f 3 쓸f6 24 各h5 쓸6 25 fxe4 쓸xh5 26 2f3 \＆
留e7 31 公d4 씀d7 32 e5 目d5 33 e6 쓸 c8 1：0
［Editor－How can you convince young players that they should not move the same piece too often in the opening！The black KN moves 7 times in the first 10 moves，but it still looks quite good！Indeed，the entire game is a rather strange encounter．］

The reader can see that $I$ was crushed（badly）so I tried harder in our next game．

Olympiad XI Final，1992－6
White：David Kilgour（SCO）
Black：Joe De Mauro（USA）
French－MacCutcheon C12

| 1 | $e 4$ | e6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | d4 | $d 5$ |
| 3 | $2 c 3$ | $2 f 6$ |

This line of the French is not often played these days but does give quite interesting positions where the books are sometimes out of date．

```
5 e6
h6
```


## 6 ふe3

$6 \$ \mathrm{~d} 2$ is more popular but perhaps not better．For example，the following games give some idea of the kind of play that develops．

Arnhem／Amsterdam，Round 8， 1993 Van Mil，Johan V．－Murey，Jaacov 1 d 4 2 2 f 62 Nc 3 d 53 §g5 e6 4 e 4 ふb4 5 e5 h6 6 ふe3 家e4 7 世g4 ※ff 8 a 3 \＆xc3 $9 \mathrm{bxc} 3 \mathrm{c} 510 \lesssim d 3$ h 511 H H 3 公 xc 312 公 h 3 定 C 6 13 台f4 晏g8 14 会xh5 宸h4 15 g 4 2xd4 16 出 ff \＄d7，and eventually 0：1

Parthenay Open，Round 2， 1992 Capaces，F．V．－Goldgewicht，L． 1 e4 e6 2 d 4 d 53 各c3 2 f 64 Sg5 ふb4 5 e5 h6 6 ふd2 ふxc3 7 bxc3公e48 岸g4g69 公f3 c5 10 ふd3 ふd7 11 \＆xe4 dxe4 12 岩xe4 今c6 13 쓸h4 쓸xh4 14 公xh4 公d7 15 $0-0-0$ 盟c8 16 ふe3 \＆a5 17 迢f3 §xa2 18 2 2 d 2 ふd5 19 f 3 cxd 420 cxd4 公b6 21 公e4 合c4 22 昌he1悹e7 23 ふf4 皆c6 24 昌d3 a5 25备b3 b6 26 自bla4 27 夏a1 分a5
 30 告b2 分xal 31 昌xal 皆hc8 32 B3xh6 昌xc2＋ 33 它bl b5 0：1．

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
6 & \ldots . . . & 204 \\
7 & \text { Ma4 } 4 & \mathrm{~g} 6
\end{array}
$$

As in the above game， 7 它f8 is more popular but not better！Another of my games that followed this line is Mohrlok－Kilgour，World $3 / 4$－Final， 1993－95： 1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 包c3分f6 4 ふg5 ふb4 5 e5 h6 6 ふe3分e4 7 Hg 4 它f8 8 a3 Sa5 9 公e2 c5 10 dxc5 公c6 11 b4 分xc3 12 公xc3 公xe5 13 씅dl ふc7 14 公b5 \＆b8 15 c 4 a 616 全c3 쓸f6 17 目cl 合xc4 18 \＆xc4 dxc4 19公e4 留e7 20 昌xc4 安g8 21 自d4 ふc7 22 2 d 6 g 623 щ̈ d 2 安g7 24 $0-0$ b5 25 ßf4 \＆xd6 26 cxd6 쓸d8 27 d7 1：0．


This is all straight from the book． Black has won a pawn but his position is very restricted with major weaknesses on the kingside and he will find it difficult to activate the queenside pieces．
$11 \quad \mathrm{~h} 4$
쓸 C

| 12 | h5 | g5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 | $f 4$ | gxf4 |
| 14 | 쌜xf4 | Bd7 |
| 15 | 2h3 | 0－0－0 |
| 16 | 0－0 | 昌 dg8 |
| 17 | 쓸f6 | 쓸x6 |

With the ${ }_{\mathrm{H}} \mathrm{s}$ off，the black position is more difficult．If $17 \ldots$ ．．．${ }^{[ } \times 718$炭h4 threatens h3 and d4．

| 18 | 目x6 | 回g4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 | Qf2 | 昌g3 |
| 20 | 3 f 4 | －gg8 |
| 21 | Se3 | 公d8 |

If 21 ．．．昌g3 then 22 \＆d2 allows』f4 later，attacking the 百．

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
22 & B d 2 & \text { 2 b5 } \\
23 & c 3 & c 5
\end{array}
$$

This is an interesting move as it activates the black queenside pieces but White should now be much better as there follows an attack on both sides of the board．The f－file is important for White，and Black is weak on the black squares．

| 24 | dxc5 | d4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 25 | ふxb5 | ふxb5 |
| 26 | cxd4 | ふe2 |
| 27 | Qe4 |  |

Please send games（preferably annotated）to Games Editor：

George Pyrich，
53 Dunnikier Road，
Kirkcaldy，
Fife，KY1 2RL．


The 公 heads off for the black 总 and d6 attacking f7 and b7．Black must now bring his $\dot{B}$ into play．I did not calculate that when the black eg gets to d 5 it is reasonably safe．

| 27 | ．．．．． | Bxh5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28 | 公 $\mathrm{d}_{6+}$ | ㄹ．d7 |
| 29 | 目b1 | Sb |
| 30 | 2 C 8 | 日g4 |
| 31 | 公 $\mathrm{xa7}+$ | ¢ ${ }^{\text {d5 }}$ |
| 32 | $2 \mathrm{b5}$ | 旦hg8 |
| 33 | 目 12 | 台c6 |
| 34 | ふe3 | 國g |
| 35 | §xh6 | \＄g6 |
| 36 | 宿bb2 | Se4 |
| 37 | Ebd2 | 目d3 |
| 38 | \％xd3 | \＆xd3 |
| 39 | 20 ${ }^{6}$ | 安xd4 |

The position has simplified into a better ending for White but I am sure that I must have missed something along the way．

| 40 | 日 $\mathrm{xf7}^{\text {7 }}$ | 2xe5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 41 | \＆g7 | ¢́b ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| 42 | Bxe5 | ¢́xx |
| 43 | 吕 $\times 17$ | ¢्ভ̧d5 |



Bishops are usually better than knights in positions where the pawns are split as the bishop can cover the board much more quickly．In these positions，the support of the king is important in the winning process．
$50 \quad \mathrm{~g} 4$
シ्वेe5
I was now looking at positions where White is left with an a－pawn and knight against bishop．The endings books that I have are not too clear just where the king should be for this to be won，but I was starting to regret my last move as g 4 is closer to a8 than g3．I still found that Black has a difficult task ahead of him．
The winning method is to encourage the black king over to $g 4$ and then to hold the opposition as the kings move over to b8 and c8．White can
sometimes gain a move by putting the knight on $\mathbf{c 5}$ first．

| 51 | a4 | \＆${ }^{\text {7 }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 52 | 公c5 | \＄c6 |
| 53 | a5 | 它f6 |
| 54 | a6 | e5 |
| 55 | ${ }^{\text {¢ }} 12$ | －ig |
| 56 | 它g3 | S d5 |
| 57 | a7 | 3 c 6 |

This is the position that I was aiming for from move 50 ．

| 58 | 定 $6+$ | 島g6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 59 | Sc7 | e4 |
| 60 | シf4 | e3 |
| 61 | 发x 3 | Hgs |
| 62 | 戓d4 | 宫x4 |

We are now at least one move ahead of the position that could haye been reached from move 50 ．

| 63 | ¢́s5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 64 | ¢́86 |
| 65 | 2e6 |
| 66 | 氝c7 |
| 67 | 安b8 |
| 68 | 勾 55 |

The winning method is to put the knight on b7 and queen the a－pawn．

1
0
Perhaps this was revenge for my previous defeat．However，it was not enough，as I can still remember how I felt as I moved my pieces rather aimlessly in the above game，but the game．Therefore，the outcome was much more evenly balanced．


Next，another regular contributor， Alan Armstrong annotates a recent game from an ICCF 2nd Class event．

## ICCF WT／II／905

White：A．Armstrong（SCO）
Black：C．Zopfchen（GER）
Trompovsky／Torre A45／46

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
1 & \mathrm{~d} 4 & \text { 2f6 } \\
2 & \text { \&g5 }
\end{array}
$$

Bought one of these＂Trends＂ booklets byJulian Hodgson！

| 2 | $\ldots \ldots$ | $d 5$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | 2 $f 3$ | $e 6$ |
| 4 | e3 | h6 |
| 5 | \＆xf6 |  |

Not sure if I like the way it＇s going now．However，if 5 ．．．岩xf6 I shall play 6 c 4 and detonate the centre．

| 5 | $\ldots .$. | 背xf6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | $c 4$ | $ふ d 6$ |
| 7 | $c 5$ | $ふ \mathrm{c} 7$ |
| 8 | ふd3 | 2d7 |
| 9 | ＠c3 | $c 6$ |

How obliging he is to blockade the centre．Now his pieces look a bit cramped so time to unfold the flag．

| 10 | e4 | dxe4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 | 号x4 | 씰f |
| 12 | 쓸c1 | 쓸c7 |
| 13 | 0－0 | b6 |
| 14 | b4 | e5 |
| 15 | dxe5 | bxc5 |
| 16 | bxc5 | 20x 5 |
| 17 | 2 Dx 5 | Mxe5 |



White has the better development and the black 㟧 is about to be hounded．

$$
18 \text { 2 } \mathbf{d} 6+\quad \dot{g} 18
$$

If 18 ．．．\＆xd6 19 監el士．

| 19 | 成1 | Meg5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | 8 C 4 | M ${ }^{\text {act }}$ |
| 21 | 回axc1 | ふd7 |

Now we have a subtle move coming up； 22 臽edl threatens to win a pawn，viz 23 公xf7 安xf7 24 旦xd7． I was very tempted to offer a conditional continuation here but Guru Milligan always says，＇Let your opponent find the best line himself．＂

| 22 | Eed1 | g6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | 分xf7 | シxf7 |
| 24 | 感起7 | 目ac8 |

Now another pawn goes a－begging．

| 25 | \＆xg6＋ | 良xg6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 26 | 日xe7 | 是h7 |

Better was 27 ．．．© 8 g5．Now the sting is in the tail．

## 28 自d1！

．．．．and in goes the towel．If 28 ．．． $\dot{6} \mathrm{f} 7$ then 29 目ed6 when the $\dot{8}$ is forced to back rank and then the 晏s are swapped off．White＇s extra $\dot{8}$－ side pawns win easily．

$$
1 \quad 0
$$

## 

In response to our plea for games from the Bernard Partridge Memorial Tournament，David Cumming provides a short but interesting tussle．

Bernard Partridge Memorial，Sect． 3
White：F．Cottegnie（BEL）
Black：D．R．Cumming（SCO）
Veresov Attack A45

| 203 | d5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| d4 | 公 66 |
| 』g5 | 公bd7 |
| $f 3$ | c5 |
| e4 | cxd4 |
| Bxf6 | 分xf6 |
| Mxd4 | dxe4 |
| 씰 $\mathrm{xd8}+$ |  |

Here I had two references，Chess Digest＇s＂The Veresov Attack＂and Batsford＇s recent＂Beating the Anti－ King＇s Indians＂（Gallagher）．Both gave the line： 8 §b5＋§d7 $9000-0$


12 自c4（12 台c7＋安e7 13 公 $15+=$ according to Alburt） $12 \ldots$ 宜 $\mathrm{d} 8 \infty$ $\Delta \mathrm{g} 6$ and $\$ \mathrm{~h} 6+$＂．．．and the ending is controversial and unclear＂（Chess Digest）．

According to $\mathrm{BCO}=$ ．

## 9 fxe4！？

$90-0-0+$ 岁c7 10 』c4 e6 11 分xe4 2xe4 12 fxe4 $=$ in both sources， although Gallagher felt that Black＇s \＆pair should count for something．


Now Black is faced with some difficulties developing his pieces．

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{lll}
12 & \text { O.. } & \text { ふc5 } \\
13 & \text { On4 } & \text { Ee8 } \\
14 & \text { Q } 55 & \text { ఏf8 }
\end{array} \\
& 14 \text {... g6?? } 15 \text { 公 } \mathrm{g} 7+\text { + }
\end{aligned}
$$



29 ふa4

Tacitly accepting the draw by repetition．

$$
29 \quad . . . .
$$

自b4

After 29 ．．．百b4 30 Exh7？！leaves Black with a good endgame after （ 30 \＆ $\mathrm{c} 6=$ ） 30 ．．． 5 Ba xa 31 公 e 2目xe4 32 公xc3昌f4．
$1 / 2 \quad 1 / 2$

## 䫆昌甼甼

Next，David provides another of his games－this time，from one of our Quartets．

SCCA Quartet Q189
White：D．G．McRoberts
Black：D．R．Cumming
Queen＇s Gambit Accepted D25

8 Gal？？loses for White after目xc2 29 寊d1（29a4 Exg2 with c2 to follow） 29 ．．．ふd4 30 a3 目xg2－＋

$$
28 \text {..... 旦b6 }
$$

Maybe 16 \＆c3 $\Delta$ 』f7 or 16 a4 were worthwhile tries．

$$
\overline{B_{e 2}}
$$

I expected 17 ßb3

| 17 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 家b1 |
| 19 | Ehd1 |

Unpinning the 2 at last and hoping to develop the c8 \＆（19 ．．．g6 $\Delta \lesssim \mathrm{h} 6+$ or \＆c5 was another idea）．

| 20 | 293 | Sc5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21 | Bh5 + | g6 |
| 22 | $\sum_{2}$ | ¢0¢7 |
| 23 | 勾c3 |  |

I＇d expected 23 笪fl trying to play down the f－file．

| $\begin{aligned} & 23 \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | $3 \mathrm{b5}$ | b4 bxc3？！ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| －24 ．．．Sd4 |  |  |
| 25 | 國xd7＋ | §xd7 |
| 26 | 成xd7＋ | ¢e6 |
| 27 | \＆xc6 | 國xb2＋ |
| 28 | ¢801 |  |
| 28 Ėal？？loses for White |  |  |
| 目xc2 29 感d1（29a4 昌xg2 with |  |  |
| to follow | 29 ．．．\＆d 4 | a3 目xg |

$d 4$
$c 4$
$d$
公f3
d5
dxc4
定 6

| 4 | e3 | 3 g 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | BxC4 | e6 |
| 6 | So3 | 2bd7 |
| 7 | h3 | ßh5 |
| 8 | 0－0 | 3 d 6 |
| 9 | Be2 | $0-0$ |
| 10 | e4 | e5 |
| 11 | dxe5 | Qxe5 |
| 12 | 3g5 |  |

This natural move was new to me． Usual is 12 2 d4，although 12 分xe5 and $12 \$ \mathrm{e} 3$ have also been played．

12 … 13 플 b

I felt that 13 公xe5 might have been better．

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
13 & \ldots . . & \text { 公ed7 } \\
14 & \text { Ead1 }
\end{array}
$$

With the threat of e5 but maybe grabbing the pawn with 14 쓸 $\times b 7$ was O．K．After $14 \ldots$ ．．．2c5 15 \＆xf6 씰xf6 16 쓸d5 日ae8 17 e5 』xe5 18 前xc5 及xc3 19 bxc3 Exe2 things are roughly equal．

$$
14 \text {..... }
$$

## 目 8

Now Black has the initiative with pressure on the e4 pawn．

| 15 | 쓸c2 | 205 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16 | 公 d 2 | h6 |
| 17 | §h4 | S3h7 | probably better． 19 e 5 is not yet a threat（쓸c2）but soon might be． After say c6 19 b4 合cd7 20 a3 쓸c7 Black is maybe slightly better．


| 18 | $\ldots .$. | 2cd7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 19 | a3 | g5 |
| 20 | 』g3 | $\Omega \mathrm{xg} 3$ |
| 21 | fxg3 |  |



An interesting position．White＇s attacking chances down the f－file compensate for his weakened pawns．

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 21 \quad \text { … } \\
& 22 \quad \text { a } b 3
\end{aligned}
$$

Aiming at the weak spot at f 7 ．

| 22 | …． | axb4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 23 | axb4 | щ． 7 |
| 24 | 2 d5？！ |  |

Exchanges only help Black here， instead either 24 自f2 planning to double Es or 24 2f3 giving up the e－pawn but planning 2d4－f5 were worth trying．


31 ．．．．．
是d3
31．．．宣d4 is also strong．

| 32 | ${ }_{\mathrm{H}}^{\mathrm{H}} \mathrm{a} 2$ | 夏x93 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 33 | 成5 |  |

With the threat of $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{xe} 5$ and ${ }^{\mu} \mathrm{Hf} \mathrm{f} 7+$ ． Instead 33 父c4 was met by Me6！ 34 各xe5 씅xa2 35 目xa2 宣xe5 with a winning endgame for Black．

$$
33 \text {..... 呰d7 }
$$

$\Delta \vec{a} \mathrm{~d} 4+$ picking up another pawn．

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
34 & \dot{y} h 2 & \text { 目d3 } \\
35 & \text { 公b3 } & \text { b6? }
\end{array}
$$

Missing 35 ．．．．Hy d6！when the threat of 台f3\＃forces an immediate win．

| 36 | 安h1 | 慁d1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 37 | 安c1 | 是xf1＋ |

Missing another trick 37 ．．．．Mexf5！． Fortunately Black is winning anyway．

| 38 | 目通1 | Md4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 39 | 쌜ㄷ | \＃xb4 |
| 40 | 2 d 3 | 씰4 |

Parting company with the magnificent \＆

| 41 | 2xe5 | 目xe5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 42 | 背f6 | He6 |
| 43 | Hef ${ }^{\text {d }} 8$ | 安g7 |
| 44 | Mxb6 | 星x4 |
| 45 | 씰b2＋ | 島g6 |
| 46 | 쓸 c 2 | h5 |
|  | 0 | 1 |

## 是白白目目

New contributor，Geoff Lloyd，writes in support of Andy Crawford，whose letter in our last issue expressed some disappointment with the presentation of much of the contents of this column．Geoff submits a game in the＂question and answer＂format suggested by Andy．Of course，I＇m happy to take up Andy＇s idea but in my defence，I would point out that I can only include material which I receive from our readers and that most of the contributors are players rated over 2000．Like everyone else， I greatly enjoyed David Kilgour＇s annotated games in our last issue，but would also point out that not everyone can write（or play）as well as David．［Also see elsewhere the Editor＇s attempt to try to meet the needs of less strong players in under－ standing strategy and thinking， rather than simply providing detailed analysis．］

BCCC All－Play－All， 1981
White：G．Lloyd
Black：A．W．Grimmer
Evans Gambit C51
PRINCIPLES we learn from the masters and we should strive to employ them in our games．In the following game which I played a number of years ago，I manage to employ some of the principles of Rapid Development，Time，Space and Force．I hope that this game will prove instructive for players of around my own grade，1600．During the game there are a number of questions for the reader to try．These are not too difficult and hopefully will be instructive．


QUESTION：Why didn＇t Black play 9．．．2 $\mathrm{xe}^{2}$ ？

10 S $\mathrm{d}_{2}$


QUESTION：Why not 10 exf6？

| 10 |  | \＄b4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 | 2 b 2 | 2e8 |
| 12 | $0-0$ | \＃h4 |
| 13 | ${ }_{\text {H }} \mathrm{e} 2$ | ［4．h6 |
| 14 | ふc1 | \＃\＃6 |
| 15 | 203 | Be7 |
| 16 | 2 d 4 | ＂${ }_{\text {c }} \mathrm{g} 6$ |
| 17 | 国5 | $3{ }^{3} 4$ |
| 18 | a3 | ＠c5 |
| 19 | Be3 | Heb6 |
| 20 | Eab1 | 3 xe 3 |
| 21 | 目xb6 | §xb6 |

White now takes full advantage of his lead in DEVELOPMENT．
22 台 $\mathrm{e} 7+$ 多 h 8
23


What threat can you find for White？ Remember，don＇t touch the pieces！

| 23 |  | g6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 | H H 6 |  |
|  | 1 | 0 |
|  | 荗感 |  |

Now a short but instructive game fron the current Olympiad．Our Assistant International Secretary， Richard Beecham，provides the in－ depth annotations．
XII Olympiad Prelims，Sect． 14 Bd 5
White：Richard Beecham（SCO） 2280 Black：Kevin Embrey（USA） 2500 Trompovsky A45

| 1 | d 4 | 2f6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | ßg5 | $\mathrm{d5}$ |

In the 5th European Teach Champ． Board 7，the 1996 Netherlands CC Champion，Evert Poel，played 2 ．．．分e4 when I replied 3 h 4 ！？That game continued $3 \ldots$ cs 4 d5 d6 5 쓸 d3 쓸a5＋6 2 2 d 2 分xg5 7 hxg 5 $\mathrm{g} 68 \mathrm{c} 3 \Omega \mathrm{~g} 79 \mathrm{e} 4$ 各d710f4照b8 11 2 $\mathrm{a} c 4$ ．


11 … 쓸a6！？ 12 亩e3 쓸d3 13 §xd3 b5 14 父e2 b4 15 囟d2
 18 ※cc2 \＆a6 19 §xa6 目 xa6 20 a4 f6 21 a5！$\pm$.

## 3 3xf6 exf6

In another of my games from the 5th European Team Champ，CC GM Jan Jezek of the Czech Republic played the alternative $3 \ldots$ gaf6 with the continuation 4 c 4 dxc4 5 e3 c5 6 §xc4 cxd4 7 exd4 §g78 \＆e2 0－0
 쓸d6！（Better than the $11 \ldots$ a6 of the 1980 CC game，van Perlo－ D＇Adamo，which went $12{ }^{\mu} \mathrm{f} 4$ §d7
昌ad8 16 a3 \＆c8 17 包ds bs 18 ßa2 Be6 19 Qef4 \＆xd5 20 勾xd5 最fe8 21 自d3f4 22 甼e4 20xd4 23 自exd4 $3 \times 1424$ 自xd4 쓸e5 $\infty$ ） $120-0$ a6 13 日fel．The English GM and great practitioner of the Trompowsky，Julian Hodgson， recommends 13 家 $\mathrm{g} 3 \Delta$ 公h5．I spent 10 days（ $l$－Games Editor）looking at
this concluding that White does not have the time to play this（a pun？！－ Games Editor） $13 \ldots$ ．．．\＆d7 14 a3 b5 15 \＆ a 2 b 4 ！，utilising the tempo saved（the $\stackrel{\mu}{g}$ went to d6 in one move）on the aforementioned van Perlo－D＇Adamo）， 16 axb4 $2 \times \mathrm{xb} 417$ ふbl ふh6 干．

$$
4 \text { e3 ふe7 }
$$

A new move to me at the time．I assumed Black was planning to play pawns to g 6 ， f 5 and h 5 when White＇s $\dot{\theta}$－side attacking prospects are stymied．The $\&$ defends better at e 7 rather than the usual d6．

I have since met 4 ．．．\＆e7 against Dr．K．V．Ramanamurthi in the friendly international SCCA v BCCS． That game continued 5 §d3 Sc6！？ 6 c3 0－0 7 留f3 $\pm$ ．

Black can also try 4 ．．．\＄e6 when White played 5 g 3 f 56 \＆g2（ 6 §d3 －Adams－Tiviakov，1994） 6 ．．．c6 7 2d2 分d7 8 台e2 \＆d6－Hodgson－ Tiviakov，1994，both games ending in draws．

$$
5 \quad \triangleq d 3 \quad 0-0
$$

Dubious as the white h－pawn now meets its target one move earlier．
$6 \ldots$ c6 $\Delta$ 岩b6，ふe6，边 7 is the standard plan．

| 7 | 前 f 3 | c6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 8 | 首 C 2 | 公 d 7 |

If instead 9 h 4 then ．．．f5！ 10 h 5 （10 g 4 gxf 411 쓸 xg 4 安 $\mathrm{f} 6 \Rightarrow 10 \ldots$ ．．． e 6 and White＇s $\mathrm{g} 2-\mathrm{g} 4$ is difficult to execute．

| 9 | ．．．．． | 首e8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | h4 | 分8 |
| 11 | h5 | 皆d7 |
| 12 | hxg6 | fxg6 |
| 13 | 国g1 | 㽞g1 |
| 14 | 0－0－0 |  |

Played after 17 days＇thought．The other candidate moves were 14 分f4 and 14 g3 but after $14 \ldots$ ．．．2e6，I couldn＇t find a way to make progress． I was looking at sacrifices on $\mathrm{g} 6, \mathrm{~h} 5$ and f5 and they always needed the 目 on al．


Black is looking for counterplay with 17 ．．．c5 even at the expense of allowing an isolated pawn at d5．The white attack comes too soon．

On $17 \ldots$ gxh5 18 gxh5＋\＆bs
 21 昌dg1 ふe6 22 目g7！！쓸d6 （22．．．Bxf5 23 昌g8\＃） 23 쓸 xh $7+$ ！各xh724日xh7\＃．


$$
19 \mathrm{~g} 5 ?!
$$

The wrong plan．I was so wrapped up with the moves 20 and 23 that I couldn＇t see the wood for the trees！
 wins．

$$
19 \text {..... f5 }
$$

The 兌 is safe（19 ．．．gxh5 20 g 6 wins．


Once again the wrong move．An explanation to this can be found in the Olympiad Board 5 crosstable．A
hard tournament for me but as I said to our Team Captain，George Pyrich， ＂losing is not everything！＂
White should have played 21 g 6 ふxg6（21 ．．．hxg6 22 씁xf5！wins）
安xe6 24 自xg6 2 25 and Black seems to hold） $23 \ldots$ ．．． 24昌xh7＋mates quickly．

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
21 & \ldots . . & \text { 分f8 } \\
22 & \mathrm{~g} 6 & \text { \&f6! }
\end{array}
$$



The only move，anything else loses after the exchanges on $g 6$ ．

## 23 昌 $\times 27+$

23 gxf7！씀xf7 24 察h5 呰e6 25 2 g 3 wins．

| 23 | ．．．．． | 䖲x7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 | gxf7 | Sg5！ |
| 25 | Qe6 | 씽xf7 |

26 公xg5
公xg
Instead 26 ．．．씰f6 allows 27 씸h5
 30 首xg5 前xg5 31 酜xg5 公xg5 32 2 xd 7 winning．

| 27 | 自xgs | 日g8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | 岩h3＋ |  |

Not 28 쓴hlt 쓱7 29 昌h5？ allowing $\mathrm{Bl} \mathrm{gl}+$ ！Here I offered a draw as，after 28 쓸h3＋岩h7 29目h5 日gl＋ 30 公fl 昌xfl＋ 31 发d2 쓸xh5 32 쓸xh5＋White＇s winning chances are problematic．

$$
1 / 2
$$

$1 / 2$

## 

We now welcome overseas contributor，Sergey Tsirakovski，who writes from Dnepropetrovsk，Ukraine and provides annotations to his game against our columnist，Ian Marks，in a recent ICCF Master Class event． Acknowledgements to Ian Marks who assisted with the translation from Russian and added a few comments．

## WT／M／GT／344

White：Sergey Tsirakovski（UKR）
Black：Ian Marks（SCO）
Philidor C41

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
1 & \text { e4 } & \text { e5 } \\
2 & \text { 253 } & \text { d6 }
\end{array}
$$

Philidor＇s Defence which dates from the 16 th century but only acquired recognition after Philidor demon－ strated its viability．It has undergone rigorous examination by theoreticians throughout the 19th and 20th
centuries．Alexander Alekhine expressed the opinion that the defence is not fully satisfactory if White plays logically and soundly．I put in some work on this after my drubbing at the hands of Hermlin ［SCCA Magazine 53，p．36］and was sufficiently impressed to default to the black side－I．M．）

3 d4
exd4
Here one also meets Hanham＇s move 3 ．．．2d7，alternatively Nimzo－ witch＇s 3 ．．．公f6 and Philidor＇s counter－attack 3 ．．．f5．

## 4 2xd4

After 4 쓸xd4 各c6 5 ふb5 \＄d7a position characteristic of the Ruy Lopez arises．

| $\ldots$ | g6 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 203 | Bg7 |
| ふe3 | 20 6 |
| 留d2 | 0－0 |
| 0－0－0 | 206 |

Instead，Psakhis－Negelescu，Erevan 1988 went 8 ．．．自e8 $9 \mathrm{f3}$ 20c6 10安b1 公xd4 11 ふxd4 ふe6 12 公d5 a6 13 父 f 4 c 514 ふc3 쓸e7 15 h 4宣ad8 16 h 5 d 517 分xe6， $1 / 2: 1 / 2$ ．

| 9 | $f 3$ | Sxd4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | ふxd4 | ふe6 |
| 11 | 㓪 $b 1$ |  |



15 ふxb5 Eab8 16 a4！a6 17 是xd6！ axb5 18 e5 $\pm$（This is the line［11安b1］I suggested in my Hermlin notes．The present game seems to vindicate it．I＇m not convinced that Makarichev－Tukmakov is all it＇s cracked up to be for White［you don＇t expect me to tell you why，do you？！？－I．M．）

| 11 | ．．．．． | c5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | 8.3 | 些 a 5 |
| 13 | a3 | 晏ab8 |
| 14 | 205 | Hb6 |

If 14 ．．．酱 $x d 2$ then 15 自 $x d 2$ 自fd8 16 \＆e2 分e8 17 公xa7士。

## 15 ふh6



15 ．．．．．
Sxh6

15 ．．．d5 deserves attention．

| 16 | щ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 17 | e5 56 | d5 |
| 2d7 |  |  |

If 17 ．．．台 h 5 then $18 \mathrm{~g} 4 \Delta \mathrm{~h} 4-\mathrm{h} 5$ ．

| $\begin{array}{lll}18 & h 4 \\ 19 & h 5\end{array}$ | 18 | ふe4 | Sxe4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 19 | 쓸．e4 | exd4 |
|  | 20 | He6＋ | 它b8 |
| Black resigns－looks premature but | 21 | 勾xc4 | 쓸．5 |
| Black＇s prospects are very bleak，one | 22 | ふ14＋ | 它98 |
| line being 19 h 5 ßf5 to allow | 23 | $b 4$ | 览d5 |
| \＃$\times \mathrm{Eg} 6$ ，defending h 7 ，after White＇s | 24 | Hexd5 | \％xd5 |
| hxg6 20 g 4 \＄d7 21 目xd5 \＄xb5 22 | 25 | b5 | 2d8 |
|  | 26 | cxd4 | 㫫xd4 |
|  | 27 | 日c1 | 2e6 |
| 10 | 28 | ふe3 | 昌d5 |
|  | 29 | 国4 | Se7 |
|  | 30 | 自e4 | 2 L 5 |

Next we welcome new contributor， Calum Wallace from Lewis who provides an interesting endgame played in this year＇s SCCA League．

SCCA League， 1996
White：C．Wallace
（Lewis Chess Club＂A＂）
Black：W．E．Leithead
（Giffnock \＆Clarkston）
French－Advance C02

| 1 | e4 | e6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | d4 | d5 |
| 3 | e5 | c5 |
| 4 | c3 | 206 |
| 5 | 匍 13 | 3d7 |
| 6 | a3 | c4 |
| 7 | h4 | ㄹ．．b6 |
| 8 | 分bd2 | 这 35 |
| 9 | h5 | f6 |
| 10 | 國b1 | 0－0－0 |
| 11 | g3 | 2， h 6 |
| 12 | Sg2 | 297 |
| 13 | Me2 | fxe5 |
| 14 | 20．5 | 运x5 |
| 15 | 쓸 xe5 | 公 6 |
| 16 | 쓸 2 | e5 |
| 17 | \＄xd5 | §f5 |

Maybe 31 昌xe7 was better，when ．．．

 $36 \mathrm{~h} 6 \pm$ ，the $\$+2$ are superior to the 昌．

| 31 | $\ldots .$. | ふxc5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 32 | g 4 | g 6 |

This seems the natural move following the recommendation that when material down，one should seek to exchange pawns．（Similarly，if one is material ahead，then piece exchanges are called for．）However， improving the ： ．．．亡bjb was perhaps better．After say 33 f 4 g 634 自d1 Exdl +35家xdl gxh5 36 gxh5 昌f8 White will have great difficulty realising his material advantage．The pawns at both h 5 and b 5 are potential targets and the $\delta$ is superior to the 2 ．

| 33 | hxg6 | hxg6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 34 | தe2 | b6 |

Unfortunately 34 ．．．シ̈bs was no better．After 35 目e6 h2 36 合 3甼g5（36．．．\＆xe3？？allows mate in 2！） 37 安f3 b6 38 安g3，the down－ side of Black＇s 32nd is apparent．

The correct move．Instead $36 \ldots$
 39 安f3 \＆xf2？ 40 公f1！is winning easily．

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
37 & \text { 它xe3 } \\
38 & \text { 夏c7 }
\end{array}
$$

E to the 7th is always strong！ Grabbing the pawn with 38 Exg6首b3＋39 家e4 自xf2 allows Black equality．

$$
38 \quad . . . .
$$

昌 h 8
Forced（White threatened mate！）


An instructive position．Whilst his material advantage is only temporary， White enjoys three advantages：－ active $\dot{b}$ ，more active $E_{s}$ and a more advanced pawn（in the forthcoming foot－race，the value of this will soon become apparent）． These three factors should suffice for the win．

$$
40 \text {..... 目f8+ }
$$

For Black，a critical position， Instead，starting the race with 40 ．．．昌xa3 loses．A sample line goes： 41 日gg7 b5 42 g 5 b 443 g 6 b 344 $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { 自gf7 } & \mathrm{b} 2 & 45 & \mathrm{~g} 7 & \text { 宣b8 } & 46 & \text { 管b7！}\end{array}$
 + －．Of course，Black can try to vary from this but the result would be much the same．Note the significance of the features listed above：poor 它 position for Black， more active white $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{s}}$ ．

| 41 | ́g5 | 罭 $\times 3$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 42 | 4 | b5 |
| 43 | $f 5$ | b4 |
| 44 | f6 | b3 |
| 45 | 17 | 國55＋ |
| 46 | 当h6 | 目 $\mathrm{b}^{\text {b }}$ |
| 47 | Eg8 | 鳬bb8 |
| 48 | 戒18 | 目 $\times 18$ |



## 49 留 c 3

 （51 㒸g8？${ }^{\mu} \mathrm{g} 6+$ and Black wins！



 ＂a2 53 自c8 $55 \mathrm{f8}=\boldsymbol{\mu} \mathrm{a}+\mathrm{is}$ only a draw．
自xf7 51 甼xb2 a5 52 目b5！（ 52 $\mathrm{Ea}_{\mathrm{a} 2}$ only seems to draw after Ba 7 53 g 5 它b754 66 它b6 55 g 7 目a8

它b3） $52 \ldots$ ．．．年 $753 \mathrm{~g} 5 \mathrm{a} 454 \mathrm{g6a3}$ 55 g 7 自xg7 56 㒸xg $7+$ ，winning by one tempo．

## 50 自xb3

Black now resigned，faced with the following： 50 ．．．Efl 51 g 5 慁hl＋
 55 安f7 g 1 with a choice between （A） 56 g 7 家a6 $57 \mathrm{~g} 8=$ 씀（ 57 自f5！ is more clear cut） $57 \ldots$ ．．． $\mathrm{Exg}_{5} 58$ © $\mathbf{6 x g}$ a4 59 自f！wins after ．．．a3 60 自f3（ 59 安 $f 7$ ？is very careless． After ．．．安b5 60 它e6 它b4 $=61$自f8 a3 62 它d5 a2 63 目a8 安b3 and it＇s a textbook draw！）（B） 56 Ef5！The most accurate as pointed out by Calum in his analysis－the E cuts off the Black 家． $56 \ldots a 457 \mathrm{~g} 7$ ジa6 when both 58 音f6 $\mathrm{f}+\Delta$ gig and $58 \mathrm{~g} 8=\stackrel{\mu}{g}$ win easily．

10
自白自百昌
Please send games（preferably annotated）to Games Editor：

George Pyrich，
53 Dunnikier Road，
Kirkcaldy，
Fife，KY1 2RL．

Regular contributor，Tom Craig， annotates two of his recent games from the 5 th European Team Champs．

V European Team Ch．，Sect 3，Bd 5
White：T．J．Craig（SCO）
Black：R．Raymaekers（NLD）
King＇s Indian E71

| 1 | $d 4$ | $2 f 6$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $c 4$ | g6 |
| 3 | 2c3 | $\$ g 7$ |
| 4 | e4 | $d 6$ |
| 5 | h 3 |  |

This rather passive－looking move often leads to a very sharp struggle． There are two main ideas behind $5 \mathrm{h3}$ ：one is to play §e3 without having to worry about 2 g 4 ，and the other to support the advance g2－g4．

| 5 | B．．． | $0-0$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | Bg | Qbd7 |

6 ．．．c5 is popular at Grandmaster level．After 7 d 5 e6 8 ßd3 exd5 $9 \mathrm{cxd5}$ the game has transposed into a line of the Benoni where Black finds it difficult to force the normal b 7 b 5 advance， 6 ．．．2a6！？is my OTB preference．

| 7 | §d3 | c6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 8 | 2ge2 | e5 |
| 9 | d5 | cxd5 |

9．．．씁b6！？is worth consideration．

| 10 | cxd5 | 2 cc |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | $8 \mathrm{c2}$ | 25 |
| 12 | $0-0$ |  |

From now on every move involves a difficult decision．Should I have played 12 a3 to meet \＆d7 with 13 b4？

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
12 & \ldots \ldots . \\
13 & \cdots 3!
\end{array}
$$

$$
乏 d 7
$$

 was so complicated that it was easier to work out my own replies rather than try and transpose into a previously played game．

$$
13 \text {..... . 世 } 66
$$

I＇d expected $13 \ldots$ a 4 ！？in answer to which I had not decided between 14 2acl or 14 g4！？； $13 \ldots$ h6 14 \＆e3 b5 15 b4 axb4 16 axb4 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ a4（16 $\ldots$
 18 ふd3 自b8 $19 \mathrm{~g} 4 \pm$ transposes into a line given by A．Mikhalevski．

## 14 ße3！？

 쓸d8 17 自fel $\mathrm{Ea}_{\mathrm{a} 6}=$ was more circumspect．

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
14 & \ldots . . & \text { Efc8 }
\end{array}
$$

Straight from the heart rather than the head．

Perhaps $16{ }^{\mu} \mathrm{d} 2 \mathrm{~b} 517 \mathrm{~b} 4!$ ？was preferable．

16 ．．．．．
b5


17 前 d 2

17 b4！？axb4 18 axb4 La6 was difficult to assess．

| 17 | $\ldots .$. | $b 4$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18 | Sce2 | b3！？ |
| 19 | ふd3 |  |

$\Delta$ acl．Not 19 \＄bl？\＆b5 when Black＇s 』 is well placed．

```
19 .... h5!
20 f3
```

20 \＆xc5？自xc5 $21 \mathrm{f3}$ h4 22 公hl 7 simply helps Black．

$$
20 \text {..... } 2 \mathrm{Exd} 3
$$

Rene was finding this position as complicated as I was；he did not offer a conditional here．

| 21 | Hexd3 | h4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22 | 公 h 1 | 且c2！ |
| 23 | ［12 |  |

## 35 쓸b3

Both 35 씨d3！？§xg4 36 hxg 4 씀xg4＋ 37 它h2 宸f3 38 公c1 else Black wins with $\mathrm{gg}^{\mathrm{g}} \mathrm{Hg} 3+=$ and 35 安f3 及e7 36 쓸el 留f8＋ 37安g2 a4 $\pm$ are O．K．for White．

$$
35 \quad \ldots . . \quad \text { \&xg4 }
$$

I＇d expected 35 ．．．\＆e7 first when 36 公c37？loses to（ 036 Md3） 36 ．．． \＆xg4！ 37 hxg 4 쓸xg4＋ 38 安f1



 46 息 e 2 岂xh1－

| 36 | hxg 4 | Mrg4＋ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37 |  | h3 |
| 38 | 쓴 8 8＋ | 皃17 |
| 39 | 勾3 $\square^{\text {a }}$ |  |

In the above note，the 2 is at c3 and this resource is not available．

$$
39 \quad . . . .
$$

$$
3 \mathrm{~h} 4
$$

Agreed drawn in view of the perpetual check after 39 ．．．\＄h4 40 쓸c7＋它e8 41 쓸 $66+=$

$$
1 / 2 \quad 1 / 2
$$


V Euro Team Ch．Sect．3，Bd． 5 White：T．J．Craig（SCO）
Black：V．L．Cordeiro（POR） QG Slav D43

| 1 | $d 4$ | $d 5$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $c 4$ | $c 6$ |
| 3 | $2 f 3$ |  |

For some reason I have a poor record against Spanish and Portuguese opponents and even at this early stage I had decided that if the worst came to the worst I would go down fighting！

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
3 & \ldots . . & \text { 2f6 } \\
4 & \text { al3 }^{2} & \mathrm{e} 6 \\
5 & \& g 5 & \mathrm{~h} 6
\end{array}
$$

OTB $5 \quad \ldots \quad$ dxc4 is the more challenging reply but the conservative CC player finds the Moscow Variation more appealing．

$$
6 \quad 3 \times 66
$$

6 Bh4！？

7 e 3 and 7 H c 2 are safer than this aggressive attempt to force e2－e4，

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
7 & \ldots . . & \text { 2 d7 } \\
8 & \text { e4 }
\end{array}
$$

Maybe 8 g 3 is a worthwhile alternative．

| 8 | ．．．．． | dxe4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 | 边 x 4 | 쌈f4 |
| 10 | §d3 | e5！ |

Other moves leave White with a small but distinct edge．

| 11 | 0－0 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 分g | 4 |
| 13 | fel | ¢ ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |

Not 13 ．．．ße7？when 14 Qxf5！is
 흘f6 16 Eae1．


I really looked hard at the published analysis by Kishnev which I was following and began to doubt that this was any good for White．My notes show that I even considered desperate ideas such as 14 公xe4 fxe4 14 昌xe4 씁f7 16 昌ael．

| 14 |  | fxe4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | 目xe4 | 씰77 |
| 16 | 感ae1！ |  |

This attempts to improve the Kishnev analysis： 16 쓸 2 \＆${ }^{\circ} 17$ 目ae1分f6 18 多e5 \＆xe5 19 日xe5 which is considered to be＂unclear＂but Black looks good to me．

16 a5！？

My opponent commented at this point，＂You make a good move．It seems to me that 6846 （§d6）wasn＇t good now！＂
$17 \quad$ a3
The idea behind his last was to play ふb4．

| 17 | ．．．．． | 國 36 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 | 쓸c2 | g5 |
| 19 | He2 | $2 \mathrm{f6}$ |
| 20 | Q205 | 些 h 7 |
| 21 | 日e3 | c5！？ |

This bypassed all my analysis of $21 \ldots$ ．．．ふd6？ 22 c5！ßxe5（22 ．．．』b8 23 宣f3！）23 日xe5 自f8 24 盲e7 白f7（24 ．．．自g6？ 25目xb7！ 25 宣e8＋分xe8 26 前xe8＋ \＆́sc7 27 쓸e5t＝and a draw by perpetual check．

## 22 目d3！？女́s7

22 ．．．cxd4 allows 23 目xd4＋囱c7 24 c5！？with good attacking chances for White．

## 23 씀e3

There was a choice between this and 23 쓸d2 cxd4 24 百 $x d 4$ \＆d6 $\mp ; 23$ d5 §d6 $\mp$（or $23 \ldots$ h5）； 23 g4！？ axb4 24 axb4 cxb4 $\mp$ ，none of which seemed satisfactory．

$$
23
$$

cxd4
Maybe 23 ．．．S g 4 was playable． 24 2xg4 ふxg4 25 dxc5 when it＇s difficult to see how White can continue．

24 щ Hd 4 它b8
c5
I was more concerned about 25 ．．．㬝e6 when 26 c6？allows 2 g4！with nasty back rank tricks．

$$
26
$$

b4
axb4
This and his next are forced as 26 ．． \＆g7？allows 27 b5！日e6 28 b6前e7 29 쓸 3 winning after 쓸 xa5．

| 27 | axb4 | b5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | E de3 | 昌h7 |

Again 28 ．．．\＆g7 is not good． 29
 winning material．


## 32 c6

32 分 77 曻 d 533 公 7 d 6 §xd6（ $33 \ldots$ 2xc5 34 些xf8！and White is winning！） 34 公xd6 务xc5！wins for Black after 35 bxc5 昌xc5 winning material．

| 32 | $\ldots$ | 國 $\operatorname{axc} 6$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 33 | 2xc6＋ | 쌜xc6 |
| 34 | 退7 |  |

Maybe 34 公d4 was O．K．After 34 ．．．씽f6（ 34 ．．．岩b6 35 台e6） 35 쓸xf6 分xf6 36 分xb5 是b7 37 台 d 4 §xb4 38 全 $\mathrm{c} 6+$ 安 c 7 39 公xb4 目xb4，the endgame is very difficult for Black to win．

| 34 | … | \＆xe7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 35 | 日xe7 | H．$d 6!$ |
| 36 | h3！？ |  |

The alternative 36 甼7e6 allows Black to take control． 36 ．．．쓸 xb4 37 自f1 幽f4（ 37 … 岩g4 38 昌a6） 38 昌xh6 盯cl 39 国e6 b4 40 h 3 b 3 ！ -+ ．
37 昌a1
Ec4

If 37 是 7 e 6 simply 쓸 xb4．

$$
37 \quad . . . .
$$

쓸 d2
037 ．．．昌d4 when White doesn＇t have 自a8＋（the black 笪 is no longer at c 4 as in the next note．

38 目 $18+$
岂b7
Forced as 38 ．．．安xa8？ 39 쓸a5＋安b8 40 쓸 xb5 + ふb7 41 쓸 xc4 $\pm$ is very good for White．

```
39 Exc8 Hyy+
```

I really enjoyed this game．My opponent constantly surprised me with moves that nearly made me choke on my cornflakes！ 39 ．．．
 \＃ $\mathrm{cl}+$ etc．

$$
1 / 2 \quad 1 / 2
$$

## Bernard Partridge Memorial Tournament

| Section 1 |  |  | $1{ }^{1} / 2$ |  | ${ }^{3}{ }^{4} 5$ |  | ${ }^{5} 0^{6}$ | $7^{7}{ }^{8}$ |  | O | $\frac{10}{111}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DGMcRoberts | Sco |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | ANMoris | ENG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | A Deamiey | ENG | 1. | $v_{2}$ | ＋ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | CAvan Wisinger | NLD |  |  |  |  |  | 1. |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | IBraun | GER | 1 |  |  |  | ， |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | K R Winder | GER | 1. |  | ／1／2 |  | ＋ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | P Billion－Becyens | BEL | 0 |  | \％ |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | N Bertelen | DEN | 1 |  | \％0 | 0 | ． |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Glarsen | DEN | 1. |  | 0 |  |  | ， |  | －1 |  |  |
|  | FAndersen | DEN | 0 | 0. |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | IIUWessen SVE 110 Il |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mal Section 3 |  |  |  |  | 314 |  |  |  | 89 |  |  |  |
|  | DR Curnming | SCO | － |  | \％ 1 |  | 0 |  | 11 |  |  |  |
|  | IR Richards | ENG |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 1. |  |  |
|  | HP Southwell | ENG | 年 |  | －1 |  |  |  | 1. |  |  |  |
|  | JVisser | NLD | － | 1. | 0 |  | － | $0 \cdot$ | 1. |  |  |  |
|  | M Obering | GER |  | 1 |  | 1 | － 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | T Hartogh | GER | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | FContegric | BEL | \％ | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | ${ }^{4}$ | 1. |  |  |  |
|  | TTeimer | DEN | 0 | 0 |  |  | － |  | ＊ |  |  |  |
|  | PG Jensen | DEN | 0 | 0 | 1. |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | VB Andersem | DEN | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
|  | K Petterson | SVE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |















 | 6 | $H$ Kumz | GER | 1 | 1 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |





| No | Section9 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 56 | 67 |  | 89 | 10 |  | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 Sneddon | SCO | － | 0 | \％ | 0 | 6 | 0 |  | 00 | 0 |  |  |
| 2 | NH McMillan | ENG | 1 | ＊ | 1 | $1 / 2$ | \％／2 |  | $\mathrm{V}_{2}$ | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 3 | W van Leeluwn | NLD | $1 / 2$ | 0 | － |  | 1／2 |  | 0 | 0 L |  |  |  |
| 4 | H－J Koronowsh | GER | 1 | 2／2 |  | ＋ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 5 | M K Koncke | GER | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1／21 |  | － | 1／2 | 0 | \％ |  | 0 |  |
| 6 | J Harm | GER | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1／2 | ＋ | 1／2 | 1／21 |  | 1／2 |  |
| 7 | L van Damme | BEL |  | 1／2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | － | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |
| 8 | G Strombers | DEN | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1／2 | 1／2 | 0 | －1／ |  | 1／2 |  |
| 9 | H M Mortensen | DEN | 1 | 1 | 1／2 |  | 1／20 | 0 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | ＋1／2 | 0 |  |
| 10 | HRänby | SVE | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 0 |  | 120 | 0 |  |
| 11 | S Nordfiford | ISD |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | $1 / 1$ | 11 | 4 |  |



| No | Section 13 |  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  | 10 | PTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AN Msemillen | SCO |  | 0 |  |  |  | \％ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | IL Johnson | ENG | 1 | － | $1 / 2$ |  | 0 | 1／2 | 1 |  | 1／2 | ／2 |  |
| 3 | P J A Groot | NLD |  | 多 | ＊ |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | K Knebel | GER |  |  |  | － | 0 | \％ | 1 | 0 | $1 /$ | 1／2 |  |
| 5 | H Starke | GER |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |  |  | 0 |  |  | ／2 |
| 6 | T Lovholt | NOR | \％ | \％／ |  | 1／2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1／2 |
| 7 | LV Vettenburg | BEL |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | ＋ | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 8 | VF Isaksen | DEN |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | ＋ |  |  | 0 |
| 9 | N Pedersen | DEN |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | ＋ |  |  |
| 10 | F Guyon | FRA |  | 1／2 |  | 1／2 |  |  |  |  |  | － | 0 |
|  | H Haraldsson | ISD |  | V／2 |  | 1 | $2 / 2$ |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |


| No | Section 14 |  |  | 23 |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | IH Marshall | SCO | ＊ |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |
| 2 | PG Vonk | ENG |  | ＊ | 1 |  |  |  |  | \％ |  |  |
| 3 | EP de Baan | NLD |  | ＊ |  |  |  |  | 10 |  | 1 |  |
| 4 | S Haack | GER |  | 0 |  | 疗 | 08 | 1／2 |  | 0 |  |  |
| 5 | R Baat | GER |  |  |  | － | 0 |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| 6 | R Fenssud | NOR |  |  | 1 | 1 | － |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | E Vieijra | BEL | 1 |  | 1／2 | $1 / 21 / 2$ |  | － |  | 1／2 | 1 |  |
| 8 | HMortensen | DEN |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | － | 1／2 | 1／2 |  |
| 9 | IM Poulsen | DEN |  | 1 |  |  |  | \％ | － |  |  |  |
| 10 | A Getrard | FRA | 1 | 1／2 | 1 |  |  | 1／21／2 | $1 / 2$ | ＋ | 1 |  |
|  | B Thompson | ENG |  | 0 |  | 10 |  |  |  | 0 | － |  |

## OVERSEAS SUBSCRIBERS

Subscription for one year＇s editions of the Scottish CCA Magazine can be obtained from the Editor for $£ 15$（inclusive of postage）or two years for $£ 25$ ．Payment in $£$ sterling please！

## A Forgotten Tournament！ NATT II

（by John Hawkes）
In Magazine No． 30 ，May 1989 ，we
reported that all games in the above
tournament had been concluded．The
final results after adjudication were：－
1．England $441 / 2$
1．

| 2． | France | 40 | $51.81 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3．USA | $39.56 \%$ |  |  |
| 4． | Canada | $381 / 2$ | $54.86 \%$ |
| 5． | Portugal | 38 | $53.47 \%$ |
| 6． | Scotland | $371 / 2$ | $42.08 \%$ |
| 7． | Iceland | $361 / 2$ | $50.69 \%$ |
| 8．Spain | 32 | $44.44 \%$ |  |
| 9． | Ireland | 31 | $43.06 \%$ |
| 10 | Wales | $221 / 2$ | $31.25 \%$ |

NATT II，Bd 2
White：J．D．Thornton（WLS）
Black：H．Olafsson（ISD）
King＇s Indian E75

| 1 | c4 | 分6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 20， 3 | g6 |
| 3 | d4 | Bg7 |
| 4 | e4 | 0－0 |
| 5 | 3e2 | c5 |
| 6 | d5 | e6 |
| 7 | §g5 | h6 |
| 8 | \＄f4 | exd5 |
| 9 | exd5 | d6 |
| 10 | 句 5 | 目8 |
| 11 | 0－0 | 公 4 |


| 12 | 边 ${ }^{4}$ | Exe4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 | ふd2 | \＄g4 |
| 14 | h3 | \＆xf3 |
| 15 | Bxf3 | Exc4 |
| 16 | 皆b3 | Ed4 |
| 17 | M ${ }_{\text {a }} \times 7$ | 2d7 |
| 18 | Bc3 | 是 44 |
| 19 | Se2 | 安b6 |
| 20 | g3 | El 4 |
| 21 | Bf3 | 因24！ |

Stubbomly refusing to quite the 5th rank！
22 ふxg7
© 8 xg 7
（a5

A very strange post for a King＇s 夏．

| 24 | 目fe1 | 它18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 | \＄g4 | 目b8 |
| 26 | 쓸6 |  |



27 bxc 4 昌c5！snares the ${ }^{\mu}$

| 27 |  | Exd5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28 | Bf3 | 左c8 |
| 29 | §xd5 | \％xe6 |
| 30 | §xe6 | 쓸c7 |

Material equality！

| b5 | d5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 目ed1 | 쓸d6 |
| 目ac1 | He5 |
| 24 | a5 |
| 目1 | d4 |
| 國8＋ | $\dot{8} \mathrm{~g} 7$ |
| 目d8 | Ma3 |
| El 1 | d3 |
| Ėg2 | 隠b4 |
| 昌e4 | 家xa4 |
| 目 4 | 公b6 |
| 昌 xd 3 | cxd3 |
| 㫫xb4 | axb4 |



The endgame phase is instructive too．

| 44 |  | d2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45 | Sc2 | 或6 |
| 46 | 它f3 | Sts |
| 47 | 它e2 | 它d4 |
| 48 |  | 边c4＋ |
| 49 | Sie2 | ¢803 |
| 50 | ふb1 | b3 |
| 51 | $f 4$ | b2 |
| 52 | ふa2 | 安d4 |
| 53 | g4 | g5 |
| 54 | f5 | f6 |
| 55 | 旬d1 | 包c3 |
| 56 | ¢522 | 2b6 |
| 57 | Se3 | 294 |
| 58 | §b1 | 安 b 4 |
| 59 | 3 d | 203 |
| 60 | ¢ $\mathrm{d}^{\text {d }}$ | 20x5 + |
| 61 | ¢d5 | 退3 |
| 62 | ¢ ${ }_{8} 4$ | ）${ }_{\text {¢ }} \mathrm{b} 3$ |
|  | 0 | 1 |

定公公完

NATT II，Bd 3
White：T．Fayne（IRL）
Black：G．Morrison（SCO）
Sicilian Scheveningen B84

| e4 | c5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 边 13 | d6 |
| d4 | cxd4 |
| 2xd4 | 公 76 |
| Q c | e6 |
| Be2 | Be7 |
| 0－0 | 0－0 |
| $f 4$ | a6 |
| Se3 | He7 |
| a4 | Sc6 |

$10 \ldots$ b6 11 ふf3 \＆b7 12 쓸el 公bd7
公c5 16 e5 分fe4 17 会xc4 公xc4－ Kasparov／Nikitin 1986 book．

| 11 | He1 | 分xd4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | $3 \times \mathrm{d} 4$ | e5 |
| 13 | fxe5 | dxe5 |
| 14 | 單g3 | 目8 |
| 15 | 宫 1 | 3 d 8 ？ |
| 16 | Se3 | 它h8 |
| 17 | 昌ad1 | Be6 |
| 18 | Sd3 | 쓸．6 |
| 19 | h3 | 是c8 |
| 20 | 쓸 3 | Ba5 |
| 21 | ふd2 | 运d7 |



| 22 | 20 | Sxd2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | Exd2 | \＃${ }_{\text {\％}} \times 14$ |
| 24 | 203 | 2 C 5 |
| 25 | $2 \mathrm{S5}$ | \＆xf5 |
| 26 | M ${ }_{\text {¢ }} \times 5$ | $f 6$ |
| 27 | b3 | 状b4 |
| 28 | 昷fd1 | 昌cd8 |
| 29 | 쌜h5 | 目e7 |
| 30 | 㖪f | 國ed7 |
| 31 | cish2 | 쓸．3 |
| 32 | $\dot{8} \mathbf{8}$ | 目d4 |


| 33 | 家h2 | 家x 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34 | Bxe4 | Hex ${ }^{\text {x }}$ |
| 35 | 8xf3 | 目xd2 |
| 36 | 國xd2 | 因xd2 |
| 37 | \＆xb7 | 日xc2 |
| 38 | \＆xa6 | 目b2 |
| 39 | Sc4 | g6 |
|  | 0 | 1 |

NATT II，Bd 2
White：T．S．Wickens（SCO）
Black：A．Doyle（IRL）
QGD Tarrasch Defence D35

| 1 | d4 | d5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | c4 | e6 |
| 3 | 203 | c5 |
| 4 | cxd5 | exd5 |
| 5 | 20f | 206 |
| 6 | g3 | 2066 |
| 7 | Bg2 | Be7 |
| 8 | $0-0$ | 0－0 |
| 9 | \＆e3 | 204 |
| 10 | Bf4 | Be6 |
| 11 | dxc5 | \＆xc5 |
| 12 | e3 | h6 |
| 13 | h3 | 246 |
| 14 | Q 2 | g5 |
| 15 | Ses | Qxe5 |
| 16 | 2xe5 |  |

Both sides have made concessions．

| 16 | ．．．．． | Ee8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 | 发 $\mathrm{d}^{2}$ | 』b6 |
| 18 | 20 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 쓸 7 |
| 19 | $\stackrel{\text { che }}{ }$ | §55 |
| 20 | $f 4$ | Bxd4 |
| 21 | exd4 | g4 |
| 22 | Se5 | 쓸e6 |

NATT II，Bd 1
White：Z．Sarosy（CAN）
Black：P．A．Lamford（WLS）
English－Dutch A27

| c4 | e5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 句c3 | 公c6 |
| 分f3 | $f 5$ |
| d3 | d6 |
| g3 | g6 |
| Bg2 | §g7 |
| 0－0 | $2 \mathrm{f6}$ |
| 甼b1 | 0－0 |
| b4 | h6 |
| b5 | 207 |
| c5 | Be6 |
| 쓸a4 | b6 |
| cxd6 | cxd6 |
| $ふ \mathrm{a} 3$ | 目c8 |
| 쓸 4 | $2{ }^{2} 8$ |
| 目bc1 | ［4］${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| 20 ${ }^{2}$ | 國c7 |
| e3 | g5 |
| 目fe1 | f4 |
| exf4 | gxf4 |
| $3{ }^{3} 2$ | h5 |
| a4 | Bh6 |
| 荗cd1 | fxg3 |
| hxg3 | Sg4 |
| $f 3$ | $\bigcirc \times \mathrm{d} 2$ |
| 国 $\times 12$ | Sxf3 |
| Heb3＋ | ジg7 |
| d4 | exd4 |
| 团 $\times 14$ | ßxg2 |
| 家xg2 |  |

And it soon becomes evident that the Canadian veteran is master of the chessboard＇s space．

| 30 | ．．．．． |
| :---: | :---: |
| 31 | 目de4 |



NATT II，Bd 4
White：A．J．Norris（SCO）
Black：P．J．Sowray（ENG）
Dutch－Leningrad A87

| 1 | $c 4$ | $f 5$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | g 3 | g |
| 3 | $\$ \mathrm{~g} 2$ | $\$ \mathrm{~B} 7$ |
| 4 | 2 c 3 | d 6 |
| 5 | $d 4$ | $\Delta \mathrm{f6}$ |
| 6 | $\sum \mathrm{~S} 3$ | $0-0$ |
| 7 | $0-0$ | $c 6$ |

7 ．．．定c6 8 d 5 台e5（8．．．台a5！？ needs some CC tests） 9 分xe5 dxe5 and White has a wide choice of which 10 炭b3 might be best．

$$
8 \quad b 3
$$

Theory recognises another twelve possibles for White at this point！

8 $\qquad$ a5
8 ．．．h6 9 ふb2 g5 10 业c2 家h8（10 ．．．Me8！Tsvetkov） 11 䀚ad1 岩e8 12 d 5 f 413 gxf 4 쓸5 14 fxg 5 hxg 5 15 Se4 Hyg6 16 勾fxg5 ふf5 17 씅d3 台bd7 18 酜g3 昌g8 19 쓸h4 台h7 20 쓸xh7＋씅xh7 21 安f7\＃smothered mate in Kholmov－Kliavin，Vilnius 1955，

$$
9 \quad \$ b_{2} \quad 2 \mathbf{a b}^{2}
$$

9 ．．．背c7 $10 \mathrm{d5}$ 台bd7 11 公d4这 $5 \times \infty$ according to Ivkov and Skoko．

$$
10 \text { Ec1 }
$$

§d7

11 宣el
A suggestion of CC World Champion J．Sloth．

| 11 | ．．．．． | b5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | cxb5 | cxb5 |
| 13 | e4 | fxe4 |
| 14 | 2xe4 | Sxe4 |
| 15 | 因x4 | 目b8 |
| 16 | He2 | \＆f6 |
| 17 | h4 | 365 |
| 18 | 官 4 | 2b4 |



| 19 | 目x5 | gxf |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | a3 | 296 |
| 21 | 勾g5 | 些e8 |
| 22 | 及c6 | 甾g6 |
| 23 | Qxb5 | §xg5 |
| 24 | hxg5 | 昌xb5 |
| 25 | Mexb5 |  |

［Editor：Alan Norris and Graham Morrison were very strong CC players－it would be good for Scotland if they became active again！］

．．．and Black follows up his return exchange sac with a © sac to force a draw！

| 25 | ．．．．． | $f 4$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26 | gxf | 씰．4 |
| 27 | 씰 $\times 26$ | 国 $\mathrm{sf}^{4}$ |
| 28 | 쓸．8＋ | ¢ ${ }_{\text {¢ }} 17$ |
| 29 | 쓸 2 | E94＋ |
| 30 | ¢́fl | Heg2＋ |
| 31 | ¢ | $\mathrm{Ea}_{\text {e }}+$ |
| 32 | ¢ ${ }_{\text {d }}{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $88^{8} 4$ |
| 33 | 쓸 2 | 自f3＋ |
| 34 | ¢ | 80x2 |
| 35 | Mh5＋ |  |
| 36 |  |  |
|  | 1／2 | 1／2 |

国定定公完
NATT II，Bd 2
White：H．Olafsson（ISD）
Black：A．Doyle（IRL）
Spanish－Rauzer C99

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
e 4 & c 5 \\
2 \mathrm{af} & \text { Qc6 }
\end{array}
$$

| 3 | §bs | a6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | ßa4 | 2f6 |
| 5 | $0-0$ | 3 e 7 |
| 6 | El | b5 |
| 7 | \＆b3 | d6 |
| 8 | c3 | $0-0$ |
| 9 | h3 | 295 |
| 10 | 3 c 2 | c5 |
| 11 | d4 | He7 |
| 12 | 20bd | cxd4 |
| 13 | cxd4 | §b7 |

13 ．．．ßd7 did pretty well in the tournament． 14 公f1 昌ac8 15 定e3 2 c 616 a 3 （ 16 d 3 2 b 417 Bbl as 18 a 3 安a6 19 b 4 a 420 \＄ 2 b 2 是 fe $8=$ ， Munoz（ESP）－Barnes（ENG）） 16 ．．． 2 $x \mathrm{xd} 417$ 2 xd4 exd4 18 宸xd4 d5 19 e5 Bc5 20 쓸f4 会fe8 21 分fl 2h5 and Black scored a point after the silly 22 \＆xh7 + ？首xh7 23 前xf7 in Ferreira（POR）－Barnes（ENG）．

| 14 | 台f1 | 昌ac8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 15 | Ee2 | d5！？ |
| 16 | dxe5 | 2xe4 |

Somebody once opted for this line for Black against $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{E}} \mathrm{e}$ in a CC World Championship Final with catastrophic results．Doyle no doubt would have known about it by thumbing through his team－mate Harding＇s book of the Championships．

| 17 | 勾g3 | 目fd8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 | 分5 | 3 c 5 |
| 19 | Bd3 | 边4 |
| 20 | 凬c2 | 쓸b6！ |
| 21 | b3 | 退 $\times 2$ |
| 22 | 気 x 2 | 3x $2+$ |
| 23 | 它h2 | 运 3 |
| 24 | 2e7＋ | 宲8 |

# ICCF <br> INDIVIDUAL TOURNAMENTS 

Members of the Scottish Correspondence Chess Association are eligible to compete in ICCF promotion tournaments，which are structured to encourage participation by C．C．players of all standards．You can choose between World or European－only sections ranging upwards from Third Class，Second Class to First Class．Higher Class and Master Class events require evidence of C．C．playing strength with entries．

Tournaments are organised in 7 or 15 player sections，except World III Class which is 7－player only． Normally they begin as soon as entries have been received from seven different countries，although sometimes there are two players from the same country．After you have selected a Class，you need to win a Section to be promoted．

There are now possibilities to play by air mail post，fax or Email．The entry fee of $£ 6$（for 7 －player groups）or $£ 8$ （for 15 －player groups）should be made payable to Scottish CCA and sent to：

Mr．George D．Pyrich，
53 Dunnikier Road，
Kirkcaldy，
Fife，KY1 2RL．
Entry form enclosed with this magazine！

## John F．Cleeve Memorial Tournament

［by Alan Borwell］

The Canadian Correspondence Chess Association（CCCA）have organised and sponsored an International Grandmaster CC Tournament to the memory of John Cleeve，who died in 1995．John was a tremendous worker for correspondence chess in Canada，North America and ICCF for over 30 years．He was a Vice－President of ICCF and a great CC ambassador for Canadian and international correspondence chess．
I was privileged to enjoy the company and friendship of John and his wife Rae at many ICCF Congresses and feel very honoured to have been invited to participate in this tournament．The event began on 15／7／96 with the following players ：－

1．A．P．Borwell（SCO），IM， 2365
9．M．Nimtz（GER），IM， 2600
2．F．Brglez（SLO），GM， 2495
3．J．DeMauro（USA），IM， 2555
4．K．Engel（GER），GM， 2465
5．R．Hiltunen（FIN），IM， 2535
6．A．S．Hollis（ENG），GM， 2535
7．A．Kozlowicz（ARG），IM， 2515
8．M．Kurtz（CAN）， 2500
10．G．Osterman（FIN），GM， 2595
11．D．Pineault（CAN），IM， 2520
12．R．A．Redolfi（ARG），GM， 2510
13．T．Thomas（ENG），IM， 2510
14．K．Tikkanen（FIN），IM， 2500
15．B．Zlender（SLO）， 2445
GM title norm is 9 pts，and IM 6 pts


This picture was taken at the 1989 ICCF Congress in Richmond，England with George Livie （left），Ken Macdonald（centre），the current Canadian delegate，and John Cleeve（right）

## ICCF INDIVIDUAL TOURNAMENTS

（by George Pyrich）
A healthy batch of new entries this time，most of which are for the comparatively new Email events（Nos． 22 to 32 below）．Also listed are those unallocated last time（Nos． 7 to 21）．


## ICCF THEMATIC TOURNAMENTS

Sections of 5－7 players，two games against each opponent．Top two players qualify for each Final．
Entries by 15／1／97 Start on 15／3／97
3／97：Caro－Kann（B12） 1 e 4 c 62 d 4 d 53 e 5 §f5 4 分f3
4／97：King＇s Indian（E83／4）1d4 安f6 2 c4 g6 3 台c3 ふg7 4 e4 d6 5 f3 0－0 6 ふe3 2 c 6
Entries by $1 / 3 / 97$ Start on $1 / 5 / 97$
5／97：French（C12）1 e4 e6 2 d 4 d 53 父c3 公f6 4 』g5 ふb4
6／97：Semi－Slav（D43） 1 d 4 d 52 c 4 c 63 公f3 公f6 4 台c3 e65 今g5 h6 6 ふxf6 쓸xf6
Entry fee is $£ 6$ per group（payable to Scottish CCA）to：Mr．George D．Pyrich， 53 Dunnikier Road，Kirkcaldy，Fife，KY1 2RL．

ICCF OLYMPIAD XI FINAL

|  | Board 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Zilberberg | AS | IM | 2580 | USA | - | 1 | $11 / 2$ | 1 |  | 1 | $11 /$ | 1/2 | 1/21 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |
| 2 | Sloth | I | GM | 2635 | DEN | 0 | - | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 |  | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 3 | Ballon | GJ | IM | 2465 | NLD | 1/2 | 1/2 | - | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1/2 |  |
| 4 | Hébert | J | GM | 2500 | CAN | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | - | 1 | 1/2 |  | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 6 |
| 5 | Krzyszan | J | GM | 2605 | POL |  | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 4 | 1 |  | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |  |
| 6 | Bryson | DM | GM | 2580 | SCO | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | , |  | 0 | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 4 |
| 7 | Hammar | B |  | 2525 | SVE | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 1 |  | - | 0 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41/2 |
| 8 | Breazu | M | GM | 2500 | ROM | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 |  | 1 | - | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |  |
| 9 | Honfi | K | IM | 2475 | HUN | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11/2 | 0 | 1/2 |  | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | $21 / 2$ |
| 10 | Zapletal | J | IM | 2505 | CSR | 0 | 1/2 |  | 11/2 | 1 | 1 |  | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | - | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |  |
| 11 | Burger | H | IM | 2570 | GER | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | - | 1/2 |  |  |
| 12 | Webb | S | GM | 2615 | ENG | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 0 |  | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | - | 1 | 81/2 |
| 13 | Sanakojev | GK | GM | 2595 | RUS | 1/2 |  | 1/2 | 1/2 |  | 1/2 |  | 1 |  | 1/2 |  |  | 0 | - |  |


|  | Board 2 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 16 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Abram | G | IM | 2580 | USA | - | $11 / 2$ | 0 | 1 | 0 | $11 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 |  |  |
| 2 | Poulsen | A | IM | 2630 | DEN | 1/2 | + | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 11/2 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 |  |  |
| 3 | v Oosterom | JJ | GM | 2575 | NLD | 1 | 1 | - | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/21/2 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 |  |  |
| 4 | Berry | J | GM | 2570 | CAN | 0 | $11 / 2$ | 1/2 | - | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/20 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 0 |  |
| 5 | Matlak | M | (IM) | (2420) | POL | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 3/2 | * | 0 | $0^{1 / 2}$ | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 71/2 |
| 6 | Muir | AJ | IM | 2540 | SCO | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 12 | - | 1/2 | 1/2 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 9 |
| 7 | Andersson | G | GM | 2505 | SVE | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 8 |
| 8 | Rotariu | G | GM | 2415 | ROM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/21/2 | - | 11 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  | 1 |  |  |
| 9 | Meleghegyi | c | GM | 2605 | HUN | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 |  | - | 0 | 0 | 1/2 |  |  |
| 10 | Lanc | A | IM | 2570 | CSR | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 |  | 1 | - | 1 | 1/2 |  |  |
| 11 | Palm | H | IM | 2560 | GER | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/21/2 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | - | - | 1/2 |  |
| 12 | Hollis | A | GM | 2545 | ENG | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 00 | 0 |  | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | + |  |  |
| 13 | Korolev | SI | IM | 2615 | RUS |  |  |  |  | $11 / 2$ | 11/2 | 1/21/2 |  |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  | - |  |


|  | Board 3 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 13 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Maillard | WE | IM | 2550 | USA | - | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1/2 |  |
| 2 | Jensen | VN | IM | 2500 | DEN | 1/2 | - | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  |
| 3 | Weijerstrass | R | IM | 2415 | NLD | 1 | 1 | - | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1/2 |  | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |  |
| 4 | Wright | J | IM | 2490 | CAN | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | - | - | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 6 |
| 5 | Sek | Z | IM | 2570 | POL | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 0 | 0 - | 1/2 |  | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 8 |
| 6 | MeNab | CA | (GM) | 2500 | SCO | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/21/2 | * |  | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 1 |  |  |
| 7 | Carlsson | 1 | IM | 2455 | SVE | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  | - | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 1 |  |  |
| 8 | Suta | M | IM | 2455 | ROM | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | $11 / 2$ | 1/2 |  | 1/2 | - | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 5 |
| 9 | Glat | G | IM | 2505 | HUN | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | $115 / 2$ | 1/2 |  | 1 | 1/2 | 4 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |  |
| 10 | Privara | 1 | IM | 2570 | CSR |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | - | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 |  |
| 11 | Maeder | K-H | GM | 2585 | GER | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/21/2 | 1/2 |  | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | - | 1 | 1/2 | 71/2 |
| 12 | Povah | N | GM | 2595 | ENG | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 0 | - | 1/2 | 51/2 |
| 13 | Umanskij | MM | IM | 2690 | RUS | 1/2 |  |  |  | $1 / 21 / 2$ |  |  |  | 1/2 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1/2 | - |  |

Each team has a total of 72 games ( 6 boards $\times 12$ each)

|  | Board 4 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | DeMauro | JA | IM | 2615 | USA | - |  |  | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  | 1/2 |  |  |
| 2 | du Jardin | J |  | 2505 | DEN |  | - | 1/2 | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 0 |  |  |
| 3 | Idema | AA | IM | 2540 | NLD |  | $1 / 2$ | - | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |  |
| 4 | Widmann | K | IM | 2530 | CAN | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | * | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 61/2 |
| 5 | Bieluczyk | B | IM | 2500 | POL | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | - | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | $1 / 2$ |  | 0 | 1/2 |  |
| 6 | Kilgour | DA | IM | 2490 | SCO | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | * | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1 |  |  |
| 7 | Korman | U | IM | 2305 | SVE | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | - | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 8 | Mititelu | G |  | 2350 | ROM | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | - | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 41/2 |
| 9 | Fabri | F | IM | 2545 | HUN |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 10 | Mraz | M | IM | 2505 | CSR |  | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | - | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 |  |
| 11 | Baumbach | F | GM | 2530 | GER |  | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | - | 1/2 | 1 |  |
| 12 | Thomas | T | IM | 2485 | ENG | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | ¢ | 1/2 | 71/2 |
| 13 | Stoljar | SE | IM | 2535 | RUS |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ |  | 1 | 1/2 |  | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 4 |  |


|  | Board 5 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 13 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Kubach | GL | IM | 2510 | USA | 4 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 5 |
| 2 | Sorensen | T | IM | 2480 | DEN | 1/2 | * | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |
| 3 | Sprenger | EH |  | 2410 | NLD | 1/2 | 1/2 | - | 1/2 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 41/2 |
| 4 | Pineault | D | IM | 2470 | CAN | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | - | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 8 |
| 5 | Mularczyk | J |  | 2460 | POL | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3/2 |  |
| 6 | Giulian | PM | IM | 2395 | SCO | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | - | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 51/2 |
| 7 | Lindgren | M |  | 2540 | SVE | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | * | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 81/2 |
| 8 | Miron | C |  | 2660 | ROM | 0 |  | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9 | Gyôrkõs | L | (IM) | (2410) | HUN | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | * | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 71/2 |
| 10 | Trapl | J | IM | 2510 | CSR | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 81/2 |
| 11 | Anton | VM | GM | 2620 | GER | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 1/2 | 1/2 | 9 |
| 12 | Timson | P |  | 2550 | ENG | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | - | 1/2 |  |
| 13 | Korelov | AP | IM | 2590 | RUS | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | * | 61/2 |


|  | Board 6 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Camaratta | FA |  | 2530 | USA | * | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 4 |
| 2 | Hyldkrog | L | IM | 2475 | DEN | 1/2 | - | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |  |
| 3 | van Perlo | GC | GM | 2455 | NLD | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | * | 0 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 |  | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 1 |  |  |
| 4 | MacLeod | D | IM | 2520 | CAN | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1 |  |  |
| 5 | Konca | D | IM | 2455 | POL | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | $1 / 2$ |  | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Borwell | AP | IM | 2320 | SCO | $1 / 2$ | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1 | - | 1/2 |  | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 |  |
| 7 | Hjort | B | IM | 2495 | SVE | 0 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | - | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 |  |  |
| 8 | Hang | Ing E |  | 2120 | ROM | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 1/2 | - |  |  |  | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |
| 9 | Keszi | J |  | 2485 | HUN | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 |  | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10 | Göth/Sevecek |  | IM | 2460 | CSR | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  | 1 | * | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 |  |
| 11 | Kreuzer | M | IM | 2660 | GER | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1/2 | 1/2 | - | 1 | 1/2 |  |
| 12 | Sowray | P |  | 2380 | ENG | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | - | 0 |  |
| 13 | Bloch | M |  | 2590 | RUS | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  | 1/2 |  | 1/2 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*}$ |  |

Leading scores:- 1. Germany $42 / 66$ ( $63.6 \%$ ); 2. Czechoslovakia 401/2/65 (62.3\%);
3. Scotland $381 / 2 / 69$ ( $55.8 \%$ ); 4. Canada $39 / 70$ ( $55.7 \%$ );
5. Russia 24/45 (53.3\%); 6. Poland 33/64 (51.6\%);
7. Sweden $351 / 2 / 70(50.7 \%) ; 8$. England $34 / 69$ (49.3\%)

ICCF OLYMPIAD XII PRELIMINARIES SECTION 4

|  | Board 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Camilleri | H | 2395 | MLT | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | 5 |
| 2 | Markauss | J | 2545 | LAT | 1 | - | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 8 |
| 3 | Chia | C-S | (2200) | SIP | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4 | Portilho | GF | 2410 | BRS | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | - |  |  | 1/2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Har-Even | A | 2500 | ISL | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | - |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 0 |  |
| 6 | Leonardo | JP | 2430 | POR | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 |  |  | - | 1/2 |  | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1/2 | 1 |  |
| 7 | Wolny | R | 2450 | POL | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | * | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 5 |
| 8 | Cayford | T | 2420 | USA | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | - | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 9 | Miskovsky | P | 2505 | CSR | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 |  | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | - | 1 | 0 |  |  |
| 10 | Gillam | SR | 2365 | SCO | 0 | 1/2 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | - | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |
| 11 | Thorbergsson | B | 2525 | ISD | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 |  | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | - | 1 |  |
| 12 | Keglevic | P | 2305 | CRO | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 |  | $1 / 2$ | 0 | - |  |


|  | Board 2 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Aftard | W | 2110 | MLT | * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Vitomskis | J | 2505 | LAT | 1 | - | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 10 |
| 3 | Teo | B | 2260 | SIP | 1 | 0 | - | 0 |  | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4 | de Cresce | SH | 2450 | BRS | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | - |  | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 5 | Granski | M | 2495 | ISL | 1 | 0 |  |  | * | 0 |  | 1/2 |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ |  |  |
| 6 | Oliveira | AM | 2315 | POR | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | $41 / 2$ |
| 7 | Dors | R | 2500 | POL | 1 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 |  | 1 | - | 1/2 | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8 | Callaghan | RS | 2485 | USA | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | - | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 51/2 |
| 9 | Spodny | J | 2460 | CSR | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 |  | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | * |  | 1/2 | 0 |  |
| 10 | Pyrich | GD | 2335 | SCO | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 |  | - | 0 | 1 |  |
| 11 | Palsson | JA | 2455 | ISD | 1 | 1/2 | 1 |  | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | * | 0 |  |
| 12 | Klaic | P | 2450 | CRO | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 1/2 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 0 | 1 | - |  |


|  | Board 3 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  | Board 5 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Sammut |  | (2200) | MLT | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 21/2 |
| 2 | Strautinsh | V | 2470 | LAT | 1 | - | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |
| 3 | Wang | M-L | (2200) | SIP | 1 | 1/2 | - | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 71/2 |
| 4 | Amorim | GS | 2455 | BRS | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 |  |
| 5 | Eljakhim | D | (2200) | ISL | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 10 |
| 6 | Demetrio/Cordiero |  | 2285 | POR | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - |  | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |
| 7 | Haag/Nizynski | M | (2200) | POL | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | - | 0 |  | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |
| 8 | Embrey | K | 2500 | USA | 1/2 |  | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | - | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 |  |
| 9 | Marczell | P | 2475 | CSR | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 |  | 1/2 | * | 1 | 0 | 1/2 |  |
| 10 | Beecham | CR | 2235 | SCO | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{6}$ | 0 | 0 | 1/2 |
| 11 | Thorsteinsson | E | 2360 | ISD | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | - | 0 | 4 |
| 12 | Krivic | D | 2245 | CRO | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | * | 7 |


|  | Board 6 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Mifsud | T | (2200) | MLT | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Dauga | Z | 2450 | LAT | 1 | ¢ | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 |  |
| 3 | Leong | V | (2200) | SIP | 1 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 4 | Barata | HAG | (2200) | BRS | 1 |  | 1 | - |  | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 |  | 1 | 1/2 |  |  |
| 5 | Oren | I | 2410 | ISL | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | - |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 0 |  |
| 6 | Morais | VM | 2375 | POR | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 |  | - | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7 | Sapa | W | 2240 | POL | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 0 | 4 |  | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ |  |
| 8 | Owen | L | 2420 | USA | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | - |  | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ |  |  |
| 9 | Laurenc | P | 2445 | CSR | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | - | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |
| 10 | Jenkins | DM | 2310 | SCO | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | - | 1/2 | 0 | $31 / 2$ |
| 11 | Halldorsson | JA | (2200) | ISD | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | - | 1/2 | 7 |
| 12 | Strucic | I | (2200) | CRO | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1/2 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $\leqslant$ |  |


|  | Board 4 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Pis |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Camilleri | S | (2200) | MLT | - | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 11/2 |
| 2 | Strautinsh | U | 2485 | LAT | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 9 |
| 3 | Teo | K-C | 2310 | SIP | 1/2 | 0 | * | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 4 | Alvarenga | RF | 2435 | BRS | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | - | 1/2 | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 5 | Azar | P | 2455 | ISL | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | - | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 |  |
| 6 | Almeida | MC | (2200) | POR | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | - | 1/2 | 1/2 |  | 1 |  | 1/2 |  |
| 7 | Marcinkiewicz | A | 2405 | POL | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1/2 | * |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |
| 8 | Martinowsky | E | 2380 | USA | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ |  | - | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1/2 | 1 |  |
| 9 | Danek | L | 2545 | CSR | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |  | 1 | 1/2 | - | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1/2 |  |
| 10 | Livie | DM | 2290 | SCO | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | - | 1/2 | 1/2 | 4 |
| 11 | Gudmundsson | K | 2385 | ISD | 1 | 1/2 | 1 |  | 0 |  |  | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | - | 0 |  |
| 12 | Movre | D | 2345 | CRO | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 1 | * | 5 |

## V EUROPEAN TEAM CHAMPIONSHIP PRELIMINARIES - SECTION 3

| No | BOARD 1 - C.A. | McNAB 41/2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Quaresma, C R | (POR) 2420 | - | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 |  | 1/2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Rumiancevas, B | GM (LIT) 2535 | 1/2 | - |  | $1 / 2$ |  | 0 | 1/2 |  | 1/2 |  |  |
| 3 | De Ruiter, T | (NLD) 2390 | 1/2 |  | - |  | 0 | 1/2 | 0 |  |  | 1/2 |  |
| 4 | Morris, C F | (WLS) (2380) | 1/2 | 1/2 |  | - | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 |  | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ |  |
| 5 | Neuvonen, O | (FIN) 2435 | 0 |  | 1 | $1 / 2$ | - |  | 1/2 | 1 |  | 0 |  |
| 6 | Roose, J | (BEL) 2365 |  | 1 | 1/2 | 1 |  | - | $1 / 2$ |  | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |
| 7 | McNab, CA | IM (SCO) 2520 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | - | 1 |  | 1/2 |  |
| 8 | Mraz, M | IM (CZE) 2525 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | - |  | 0 |  |
| 9 | Timoschenko AG | IM (UKR) 2505 |  | 1/2 |  | 1/2 |  | 1/2 |  |  | - | 1/2 |  |
| 10 | Boissel, B | (FRA) (2510) |  |  | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1/2 | $\uparrow$ |  |



| No | BOARD 3 - A.P. | BORWELL 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Rosa, ARB | (POR) (2385) | - |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1/2 |  |
| 2 | Milyydas, V | IM (LIT) 2475 |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 1/2 |  |  |  | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ |  |
| 3 | Quakkelaar, M J | (NLD) 2505 | 1/2 |  | - | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1/2 |  |
| 4 | Macdonald, J | (WLS) (2200) |  |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 5 | Lehto, A | (FIN) 2395 |  | 1/2 | 1 |  | - |  | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |
| 6 | Joseph, F | (BEL) 2235 |  |  | 0 | 1 |  | $\bullet$ | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 |  |  |  |
| 7 | Borwell, A P | IM (SCO) 2360 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | - |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Sevecek, R | IM (CZE) 2530 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1/2 |  | - |  |  |  |
| 9 | Muraviev, S | (UKR) (2200) |  | 1/2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| 10 | Feroul. M | IM (FRA) 2455 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1/2 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | - |  |



V EUROPEAN TEAM CHAMPIONSHIP PRELIMINARIES - SECTION 3


| No | BOARD 7 - C.R. BEECHAM 6 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Peres, J C M | (POR) | (2200) | * |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | 1/2 |  |  |
| 2 | Kupsys, A | (LIT) | 2445 |  | - | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | 1/2 |  |
| 3 | Poel, E | (NLD) | 2305 | 0 | 1/2 | - | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 31/2 |
| 4 | Thomas, M | (WLS) | 2340 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | - | 1 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1/2 | $41 / 2$ |
| 5 | Sabel, H | (FIN) | 2340 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Van de Wynkele, H | H (BEL) | 2345 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 51/2 |
| 7 | Beecham, C R | (SCO) | 2270 | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 |  | 0 | - | 0 |  | $1 / 2$ |  |
| 8 | Jezek, I | (CZE) | 2495 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | - | 0 | 1/2 |  |
| 9 | Bondar, W N | IM (UKR) | 2420 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  | $1 / 2$ |  | 1 | - |  |  |
| 10 | Grizou, R | (FRA) | 2440 |  | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 |  | - |  |


| No | BOARD 8 - D.M. JENKINS 6 |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Neves, JJAC | (POR) (2200) | * |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 2 | Dambrauskas, V | IM (LIT) 2490 |  | $\bullet$ |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1/2 |  |  |  |
| 3 | Lambers, G H | (NLD) 2390 | 1 |  | - |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 4 | Garcia, J/Griffiths | (WLS) (2200) |  | 0 |  | - | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5 | Luoma, J | (FIN) 2360 |  |  |  | 1 | - | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 6 | Beniest, R | (BEL) (2200) | 1 | 0 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | - | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 0 | 1 |  |
| 7 | Jenkins, D M | (SCO) 2325 | $1 / 2$ |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ |  | $1 / 2$ | - | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 8 | Teichmann, C | (CZE) 2425 | 1 | $1 / 2$ |  | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | - |  |  |  |
| 9 | Chichlow, II | (UKR) 2475 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | * |  |  |
| 10 | Pecot, L | (FRA) 2505 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |

## V EUROPEAN TEAM CHAMPIONSHIP PRELIMINARIES - SECTION 3

| No | BOARD 9-R.W | M. BAXTER 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Marques, J LS | (POR) (2215) | - | 0 |  | 1/2 |  |  |  | 1/2 |  |  |  |
| 2 | Agejevas, A | IM (LIT) 2455 | 1 | - |  |  |  |  | 1/2 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 3 | Plomp, M P | (NLD) 2440 |  |  | - | 1 |  | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |  |  |
| 4 | Baker, A P | (WLS) (2200) | 1/2 |  | 0 | - | 1/2 | 0 | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 5 | Kilpi, T | (FIN) (2200) |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ | - | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |  |  |
| 6 | De Beck, E | (BEL) (2200) |  |  | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | - | 1/2 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 7 | Baxter, R W M | (SCO) (2260) |  | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | - |  | 1/2 |  |  |
| 8 | Sedlacek, O | (CZE) (2275) | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 |  | - |  | 0 |  |
| 9 | Meshebizkij, S I | (UKR) 2455 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1/2 |  | - |  |  |
| 10 | Rousselot, B | (FRA) 2375 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | * |  |


| No | BOARD 10-T. THOMSON |  | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Ferreira, J G | (POR) | 2235 | - | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Rubinas, P | (LIT) | (2380) | 1/2 | - |  | 1 | $1 / 2$ |  | 1/2 |  |  | 1/2 |  |
| 3 | Van de Kley, C | (NLD) | 2430 | 1 |  | - | 1 | 1 | 1/2 |  |  | 1/2 | 0 |  |
| 4 | Griffith M J | (WLS) | 2230 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 5 | Jaatinen, P | (FIN) | 2340 | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | - |  | 1/2 | 1/2 |  | 1/2 |  |
| 6 | Laurent, C | (BEL) | 2250 | 0 |  | 1/2 |  |  | - | 0 |  | 1/2 | 0 |  |
| 7 | Thomson, T | (SCO) | (2200) |  | 1/2 |  | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | - |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Urban, J | (CZE) | 2395 |  |  |  |  | 1/2 |  |  | 4 |  | 1/2 |  |
| 9 | Miljutin, O P | IM (UKR) | 2435 |  |  | 1/2 |  |  | 1/2 |  |  | - | 1/2 |  |
| 10 | Del Gobbo, M | (FRA) | 2520 |  | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | - |  |


| No | BOARD 11-1.A. MARKS |  | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Peres, JL M | (POR) | (2200) | - |  | 0 | 1 | $1 / 2$ |  | 1 | $1 / 2$ |  | 1 |  |
| 2 | Sutkus, V | (LIT) | 2270 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 3 | Pillhock, U D | (NLD) | 2440 | 1 |  | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 4 | Clifford, N | (WLS) | (2200) | 0 |  | 0 | - | 0 |  | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 5 | Hietanen, P | (FIN) | 2320 | 1/2 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | - | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |
| 6 | Deschamp, G | (BEL) | (2200) |  |  | 0 |  | $1 / 2$ | 4 | 1 | 1/2 |  | 0 |  |
| 7 | Marks, I A | (SCO) | (2200) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | - | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 |  |
| 8 | Lizan, L | (CZE) | 2410 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 |  |  | 1/2 | 1/2 | - |  |  |  |
| 9 | Pawlenko, J B | (UKR) | 2420 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 1/2 |  | - |  |  |
| 10 | Muller, J | (FRA) | (2200) | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 |  |  | - |  |


| No | BOARD 12 - C.F. BOYLE |  | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Rodrigues, J C | (POR) | (2200) | * |  | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 2 | Vaitonis, V | (LIT) | 2465 |  | - |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 |  | 1/2 |  |  |  |
| 3 | Etmans, M D | (NLD) | 2300 | 1/2 |  | - | 1 | 0 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 4 | Grier, C | (WLS) | 2200 | 0 |  | 0 | - | 0 | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 5 | Johansson, C-E | (FIN) | 2320 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | * | $1 / 2$ |  | 1/2 |  | 0 |  |
| 6 | Rodriguez, M | (BEL) | 2385 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | - | 1 | 1/2 |  | 0 |  |
| 7 | Boyle, C F | (SCO) | (2200) | 1/2 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 |  | 0 | - | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 8 | Pletanek, J | (CZE) | 2405 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | - |  | 1/2 |  |
| 9 | Stawnitschuk, A P | (UKR) | (2200) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| 10 | Spitz, C | (FRA) | (2200) | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ |  | * |  |

4th NORTH ATLANTIC TEAM TOURNAMENT



| D Boucher |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D. Bouchez | FRA | 2200 | - |  |  |  | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Cody | CAN | 2375 |  | - |  |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| D. Kopec | USA | 2410 |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1/2 |  |  |
| D. J. Stewart | SCO | 2410 |  |  |  | - |  | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 |  |  |  |
| O. Lorentzen | NOR | 2445 | 1/2 |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| J.A. Barrios Tronsco | ESP | 2460 | 1/2 |  |  | 1/2 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| M. Thomas | WLS | 2290 | 1/2 | 1/2 |  | 1/2 |  |  | - |  | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ |
| J.L.M. Peres | POR | 2500 |  |  |  | 1/2 |  |  | 1 | - |  |  |  |  |
| M.J. Read | ENG | 2500 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  | - | 1/2 |  |  |
| J.A. Palsson | ISD | 2410 |  | 1/2 |  |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  | 1/2 | - |  |  |
| C. O'Hare | IRL | 2200 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1/2 |  |  |  | - |  |





## */ Chess Mail

The essential new magazine for all correspondence and Internet players Edited by Tim Harding
January 1997 first edition now available!
Includes Story of GM Ulf Andersson's Brilliant Postal Chess Debut How to Become a CC-GM and

## Information about Email Chess Events

64 pages of interest for all correspondence chess players.
Annual subscription for 1997 (11 editions) available from Qualitext Business Services for $£ 26$ p.a. ( $£ 29$ less $10 \%$ SCCA Members/Subscribers Discount)

## READER'S LETTERS

Responding to Bernard Milligan's letter in the last issue of the Magazine, Raymond Baxter, SCCA Grading Officer, writes ......
"With regard to Bernard Milligan's letter in the September Bulletin, I agree that the problem of discrepancies between SCCA and ICCF grades is of concern.

This problem is not new. For many years there have been increases generally for Scottish players achieving ICCF ratings. However, the size of the increases is now larger than ever and this does reduce the credibility of both systems.

I do not think that the SCCA system has been drastically under-estimating a player's strength. The SCCA grades are reasonably consistent with those for over-the-board chess, being about 100 points higher for players with recognized grades. I think that this is a fair reflection of the improvement which a player can achieve by having more time to consider his/her moves.

I think the problem is more likely to lie with the ICCF ratings, in particular as to how results are handled against players who do not yet have ICCF ratings. It is possible that the ICCF system of estimating ratings for unrated players is too generous.

We intend to raise our concerns with ICCF and also to find out whether these discrepancies apply to other countries besides Scotland.

Ideally, a player's grade should take account of his results at all levels. This could be done if the ICCF system were to take account of all national tournaments, whatever the level. Whether this will be feasible in the foreseeable future I do not know, but it is something which should be investigated. If it were feasible, it would avoid the problem which Bernard raises of an ICCF player doing badly in a lower level Scottish toumament, without his grade being reduced. However, unlike Bernard, I do not think any player can 'happily' lose all his games in a tournament, even if his grading is unaffected.
I agree that we do not want a nation of $2000+$ players irrespective of strength, but until we have investigated all the possibilities I think it would be premature to abandon the use of ICCF ratings in domestic tournaments.
I intend to keep members posted as to developments and in the meantime I should welcome any further comments on ICCF or SCCA grading, whether in the Magazine or direct to me."

## Colin Macgregor writes. <br> $\qquad$

"My concern over the ICCF/SCCA grading lists are as follows: If I, as someone with an SCCA grade, manage by chance to beat an ICCF-rated player in an SCCA toumament, such as the SCCA League Division 3, how would it be graded? This happened to me a couple of years ago, when I played and lost to Michael Dyer in the League. Personally, I am of the opinion that those players with ICCF ratings should also have SCCA ratings, thus removing an anomaly from the system."

## READER'S LETTERS

......... and Philip Giulian's views on the question of ratings :-
"As one of the prime movers for the use of ICCF ratings within our own SCCA grading system, I feel I must reply to Bernard Milligan's letter in the last issue of our Magazine. The first point to make is that the ICCF rating system is the system and any national system can only be a reflection of it. Any dubiety and the ICCF list must take precedence.
Many of our internationally rated players do not play in domestic events. Those who do, tend to play in our "top" events which are rated by ICCF. Thus for all these players their ICCF rating is completely accurate. On the other hand, past experience has shown that few players send their international tournament results to the Scottish Grader. Clearly any attempt to have Scottish gradings for these players would be a pointless and inaccurate exercise.

So what is the problem? Bernard seems to have identified players with ICCF ratings who play in the Premiers in Scotland. If this is a substantial number, why do we not try to have our Premiers rated by ICCF? I suspect however that few players fall into this category, although here obviously is a problem as neither rating system is likely to be completely accurate. I still hold the view that we should stick with ICCF for a number of reasons :

1. The ICCF list is the list, upon which ours is based.
2. Not to use ICCF ratings would produce anomalies if a player in the Premiers was promoted to the Candidates, whereby his/her "Scottish" grade would be replaced by his/her ICCF rating.
3. The quick time control and adjudications in the Premiers definitely affect some results.

A busy time in an international game and you can leave the move for a week, whereas in the Premier a hasty move has to be made. I know from personal experience how the threat of pending adjudication has forced players to accept draws or resign games. Many advantages have not been sufficient to persuade the adjudicator to award a win, when if the game had continued, the full point may have been netted. I have even been involved in a few games where the adjudicator has awarded a draw because he didn't know! (These were not in Scottish events!!)

Bernard is correct when he says we are all playing on a level playing field, but the field in one year events is different from others. I suppose a comparison in over-the-board chess is to suggest that Allegro games should be included in the main grading list. Surely not!
4. Not having to calculate grades for many of our players greatly reduces the very onerous work done by our Grader.
5. If a player has "fluked" his/her way to an ICCF rating, then he/she will lost it over time as more games are played. However, the vast majority of players deserve their ICCF rating, have earned it and should be allowed to keep it and have it used in Scotland."


## TRENDS

These excellent openings booklets contain 100 recent games selected by IMs and GMs for their theoretical ideas and importance. The following are available from QBS for $£ 3.95$ each (or $£ 10$ for any 3), incl. postage and packing

- Benko Gambit Volume 2
- English ....c5 Volume 2
- King's Indian 4 Pawns Attack
- QGD Tarrasc/Semi-Tarrasch
- Scheveningen
- Advance Caro-Kann Volume 2
- French Advance Volume 2
- Ruy Lopez Anti-Marshall
- Caro-Kann Panov Botvinnik Vol. 2
- Sicilian Najdorf Volume 2
- Catalan
- QGA Volume 2
- French Tarrasch Volume 2
- French Winawer Volume 2
- Closed Spanish Volume 2
- Caro-Kann 5 Nxf6 Volume 2
- Alekhine Volume 2
- Elephant Gambit
- French Classical Vol. 2
- Anti Sicilian
- Sicilian -Sveshnikov Vol. 2
- Sicilian - Richter Rauzer Vol. 2
- Spanish-Exchange Vol. 2


## CHESS DIGEST

Black Defensive Systern 1...d6, Soltis ................... $£ 11.95$ Catalan, Smith/Hall......................................... 110.95 Winning with English Defence (1 ... b6), Soltis...... $£ 11.95$ Goring Gambit Acc \& Dec, Smith/Hall,................ 111.95 Winning with King's Gambit Accepted - Vol.1........ $£ 11.95$ Winning with King's Gambit Declined -Vol. $2 . . . . . . . . £ 11.95$ Lasker's Def to Queen's Gambit, Soltis.................... £11.95 Modem Defence, Smith/Hall. $£ 11.95$ Noteboom Vanation, Soltis, £ 9.95 Veresov Attack, Smith/Hall ................................ 611.95 Trompovsky Attack, Soltis Hempovsky Actack, Solitis...................................... f 1195 Ruy Lopez Exchange, Soltis....................................................95 lav-W nawer Counter, Schilter $£ 11.95$ Grand Prix Attack Smith/Hal E10.95 Beating Ruy Lopez with Fianchetro Var, Soltis....... $£ 10.95$ Lisisin Gambil, Gordon. £ 9.95 Queen's Gambit Accepted Smith/Hall. 611.95 How to Pay Tore Autack (2nd Ed) Schiller........ 10.95 Evans Gambitre Two Knights, Harding Sicilian Scheveningen (2nd Ed ) Soltis 12.95 How to Play Fischer Attach v Sicilian Najidorf ...... $£ 11.95$ Winning with Giuoco/ Max I ange (2nd Ed) Soltis fl195 Bird-Larsen Attack (2nd Ed), Soltis $f 11.95$ King's Indian Atlack Smith/Hall $\begin{array}{r}61.95 \\ 512.95 \\ \hline\end{array}$ King's Indian Attack, Smith/Hall............................ 112.95

Qualitext

## Business Services

Postal Chess Supplies from the specialists
This service is for all postal chess players, with especially favourable terms available for Scottish CCA members and subscribers to the Scottish CCA Magazine. (Overseas customers are very welcome but please add $10 \%$ to cover extra postal costs.)

Prices
(incl post packing)

- Scottish CCA International Postcards (the best)
per 100 cards.........$€ 3.25$
per 250 cards.......$£ 7.50$
per 500 cards........$£ 14.00$
- Scottish CCA Scorecards (2 games per card) per 25 cards .................... $£ 2.00$
per 100 cards ................... 16.50
- Window Envelopes (for SCCA Scorecards) per 100 envelopes.............. £ 2.50
- Correspondence Chess record sheets per 50 sheets ................................. $£ 3.50$ Ring Binder (for containing CC record sheets) ..................................... £ 3.00
- "Slot-in" boards/sets
per 12 boards/sets......... $£ 12.00$
Vinyl album for storing
each........ £ 3.00
- "Adhering" boards/sets per 12 boards/sets.......... $£ 14.50$ Vinyl album for storing each....... £ 2.50
- "Peel \& Stick" Diagrams/Sets (various combinations)

Sample/Quotations on enquiry


## Chess Books

Supplies of Batsford, Cadogan, Trends, Chess Digest and other chess books are available from Qualitext Business Services. A selection of books published recently, which are considered to be useful for postal chess, are shown in the panels on the previous page and overleaf. Scottish CCA Members and Magazine Subscribers are entitled to a special 10\% discount from Qualitext Business Services on orders placed for all chess books.

Enquiries, orders and cheques made payable to "Qualitext Business Services" (whose proprietors are Moira and Alan Borwell), to 8 Wheatfield Avenue, Inchture, Perthshire, PH14 9RX, Scotland. We can be contacted by telephone from 3 pm to 10 pm daily on 01828-686556, fax 01828-686004, Email: 100737.766@compuserve.com.

## Published

Beating the Sicilian 3 -Nunn/Gallagher......................................... $£ 14.99$$£ 14.99$Blackmar-Diemer Gambit - Gary Lane...
lackmar-Diemer Gambit ..... 10.99

- Complete c3 Sicilian - Chandler ..... $£ 14.99$
Complete Defence for Black - Keene \& Jacobs. ..... $£ 13.99$
Complete Vienna - Tseitlin/Glazkov ..... E12.99
- Dutch for Attacking Player - Pederson£14.99
- Guide to Attacking Chess - Lane ..... ع10.99
- H.O.T. Chess - Paul MotwaniE12.99
Main Line King's Indian - Nunn/Burgess. ..... $£ 17.99$
New Ideas in the Alekhine Defence - Burgess.$£ 10.99$
New Ideas in the Sveshnikov Sicilian - Neverov/Marusenko. ..... $£ 12.99$
Opening Repertoire for White - Keene/Jacobs
£15.99
Positional Play - Dvoretsky \& Yusupov.. ..... $£ 17.99$
Secrets of Minor Piece Endings - John Nunn..£14.99
Technique for the Tournament Player - Dvoretsky/Yusupov.... ..... £17.99
The Giuco Piano - Gufeld/Stetsko.£12.99
£1.99
Think Like a Chess Master - Gambits - Graham Burgess. ..... £ 7.99
Think Like a Chess Master - Planning - Neil McDonald. ..... £ 7.99
Think Like a Grandmaster - Alexander Kotov ..... £13.99
Understanding the Spanish - Taulbut ..... 12.99
Vishy Anand - Chess Super Talent - David Norwood 14.99
Winning Endgame Technique - Beliavsky/Mikhalchishin ..... $£ 13.99$
Winning with the Kan-Mortazavi ..... $£ 12.99$
Chess in the Fast Lane - Bill \& Michael Adams ..... E12.99
Chigorin Queen's Gambit - Dunnington$£ 13.99$
$£ 15.99$
English Opening - Symmetrical - Vadimir Bagirov ..... 15.99
+8.99
Kasparov v Anand - World Chess Championship - King .
$£ 12.99$
- Ming Indian - Averbakh - Petursso ..... $£ 12.99$
Opening Repertoire for the Attacking Player - Gufeld ..... $£ 14.99$
Play the French - Watson$£ 10.99$
- Queen's Indian - Lalic ..... £14.99
Taimanov's Selected Games -Mark Taimanov£ 9.99
The Chess Teacher - Phillips ..... $£ 10.99$
The Modern Chess Self-Tutor - David Bronstein ..... $£ 10.99$
The Open Spanish - Krasenkov ..... £12.99
The Sorcerer's Apprentice - Bronstein \& Fürstenberg ..... $£ 14.99$
The Sveshnikov Sicilian - Mikhail Kr ..... $£ 14.99$



# MAKE THE RIGHT MOVE 



## WE CAN HELP

## GAㅡㅡㅡㅡㅡㄹ

## General Accident


[^0]:    Wanted!
    More articles needed for future editions of your Magazine. Stories, anecdotes, games, openings, reviews, etc, etc!

[^1]:    1 ．．．．．

